NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCIV.

DECEMBER 7, 1906.

CHAPTERS FROM MY AUTOBIOGRAPHY.—VII.

BY MARK TWAIN.

PREFATORY NOTE.—Mr. Clemens began to write his autobiography many years ago, and he continues to add to it day by day. It was his original intention to permit no publication of his memoirs until after his death; but, after leaving "Pier No. 70," he concluded that a considerable portion might now suitably be given to the public. It is that portion, garnered from the quarter-million of words already written, which will appear in this REVIEW during the coming year. No part of the autobiography will be published in book form during the lifetime of the author.—EDITOR N. A. R.

I WAS always heedless. I was born heedless; and therefore I was constantly, and quite unconsciously, committing breaches of the minor proprieties, which brought upon me humiliations which ought to have humiliated me but didn't, because I didn't know anything had happened. But Livy knew; and so the humiliations fell to her share, poor child, who had not earned them and did not deserve them. She always said I was the most difficult child she had. She was very sensitive about me. It distressed her to see me do heedless things which could bring me under criticism, and so she was always watchful and alert to protect me from the kind of transgressions which I have been speaking of.

*Copyright, 1906, by HARPER & BROTHERS. All Rights Reserved.

Copyright, 1906, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY All Rights Reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When I was leaving Hartford for Washington, upon the occasion referred to, she said: "I have written a small warning and put it in a pocket of your dress-vest. When you are dressing to go to the Authors' Reception at the White House you will naturally put your fingers in your vest pockets, according to your custom, and you will find that little note there. Read it carefully, and do as it tells you. I cannot be with you, and so I delegate my sentry duties to this little note. If I should give you the warning by word of mouth, now, it would pass from your head and be forgotten in a few minutes."

It was President Cleveland's first term. I had never seen his wife—the young, the beautiful, the good-hearted, the sympathetic, the fascinating. Sure enough, just as I had finished dressing to go to the White House I found that little note, which I had long ago forgotten. It was a grave little note, a serious little note, like its writer, but it made me laugh. Livy's gentle gravities often produced that effect upon me, where the expert humorist's best joke would have failed, for I do not laugh easily.

When we reached the White House and I was shaking hands with the President, he started to say something, but I interrupted him and said:

"If your Excellency will excuse me, I will come back in a moment; but now I have a very important matter to attend to, and it must be attended to at once."

I turned to Mrs. Cleveland, the young, the beautiful, the fascinating, and gave her my card, on the back of which I had written "*He didn't*"—and I asked her to sign her name below those words.

She said: "He didn't? He didn't what?"

"Oh," I said, "never mind. We cannot stop to discuss that now. This is urgent. Won't you please sign your name?" (I handed her a fountain-pen.)

"Why," she said, "I cannot commit myself in that way. Who is it that didn't?—and what is it that he didn't?"

"Oh," I said, "time is flying, flying, flying. Won't you take me out of my distress and sign your name to it? It's all right. I give you my word it's all right."

She looked nonplussed; but hesitatingly and mechanically she took the pen and said:

"I will sign it. I will take the risk. But you must tell me

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all about it, right afterward, so that you can be arrested before you get out of the house in case there should be anything criminal about this."

Then she signed; and I handed her Mrs. Clemens's note, which was very brief, very simple, and to the point. It said: *"Don't wear your arctics in the White House."* It made her shout; and at my request she summoned a messenger and we sent that card at once to the mail on its way to Mrs. Clemens in Hartford.

When the little Ruth was about a year or a year and a half old, Mason, an old and valued friend of mine, was consul-general at Frankfort-on-the-Main. I had known him well in 1867, '68 and '69, in America, and I and mine had spent a good deal of time with him and his family in Frankfort in '78. He was a thoroughly competent, diligent, and conscientious official. Indeed he possessed these qualities in so large a degree that among American consuls he might fairly be said to be monumental, for at that time our consular service was largely—and I think I may say mainly—in the hands of ignorant, vulgar, and incapable men who had been political heelers in America, and had been taken care of by transference to consulates where they could be supported at the Government's expense instead of being transferred to the poor house, which would have been cheaper and more patriotic. Mason, in '78, had been consul-general in Frankfort several years—four, I think. He had come from Marseilles with a great record. He had been consul there during thirteen years, and one part of his record was heroic. There had been a desolating cholera epidemic, and Mason was the only representative of any foreign country who stayed at his post and saw it through. And during that time he not only represented his own country, but he represented all the other countries in Christendom and did their work, and did it well and was praised for it by them in words of no uncertain sound. This great record of Mason's had saved him from official decapitation straight along while Republican Presidents occupied the chair, but now it was occupied by a Democrat. Mr. Cleveland was not seated in it—he was not yet inaugurated—before he was deluged with applications from Democratic politicians desiring the appointment of a thousand or so politically useful Democrats to Mason's place. A year or two later Mason wrote me and asked me if I couldn't do something to save him from destruction.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I was very anxious to keep him in his place, but at first I could not think of any way to help him, for I was a mugwump. We, the mugwumps, a little company made up of the unenslaved of both parties, the very best men to be found in the two great parties — that was our idea of it — voted sixty thousand strong for Mr. Cleveland in New York and elected him. Our principles were high, and very definite. We were not a party; we had no candidates; we had no axes to grind. Our vote laid upon the man we cast it for no obligation of any kind. By our rule we could not ask for office; we could not accept office. When voting, it was our duty to vote for the best man, regardless of his party name. We had no other creed. Vote for the best man— that was creed enough.

Such being my situation, I was puzzled to know how to try to help Mason, and, at the same time, save my mugwump purity undefiled. It was a delicate place. But presently, out of the ruck of confusions in my mind, rose a sane thought, clear and bright—to wit: since it was a mugwump's duty to do his best to put the best man in office, necessarily it must be a mugwump's duty to try to *keep* the best man in when he was already there. My course was easy now. It might not be quite delicate for a mugwump to approach the President directly, but I could approach him indirectly, with all delicacy, since in that case not even courtesy would require him to take notice of an application which no one could prove had ever reached him.

Yes, it was easy and simple sailing now. I could lay the matter before Ruth, in her cradle, and wait for results. I wrote the little child, and said to her all that I have just been saying about mugwump principles and the limitations which they put upon me. I explained that it would not be proper for me to apply to her father in Mr. Mason's behalf, but I detailed to her Mr. Mason's high and honorable record and suggested that she take the matter in her own hands and do a patriotic work which I felt some delicacy about venturing upon myself. I asked her to forget that her father was only President of the United States, and her subject and servant; I asked her not to put her application in the form of a command, but to modify it, and give it the fictitious and pleasanter form of a mere request—that it would be no harm to let him gratify himself with the superstition that he was independent and could do as he pleased in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matter. I begged her to put stress, and plenty of it, upon the proposition that to keep Mason in his place would be a benefaction to the nation; to enlarge upon that, and keep still about all other considerations.

In due time I received a letter from the President, written with his own hand, signed by his own hand, acknowledging Ruth's intervention and thanking me for enabling him to save to the country the services of so good and well-tried a servant as Mason, and thanking me, also, for the detailed fulness of Mason's record, which could leave no doubt in any one's mind that Mason was in his right place and ought to be kept there. Mason has remained in the service ever since, and is now consul-general at Paris.

During the time that we were living in Buffalo in '70-'71, Mr. Cleveland was sheriff, but I never happened to make his acquaintance, or even see him. In fact, I suppose I was not even aware of his existence. Fourteen years later, he was become the greatest man in the State. I was not living in the State at the time. He was Governor, and was about to step into the post of President of the United States. At that time I was on the public highway in company with another bandit, George W. Cable. We were robbing the public with readings from our works during four months—and in the course of time we went to Albany to levy tribute, and I said, "We ought to go and pay our respects to the Governor."

So Cable and I went to that majestic Capitol building and stated our errand. We were shown into the Governor's private office, and I saw Mr. Cleveland for the first time. We three stood chatting together. I was born lazy, and I comforted myself by turning the corner of a table into a sort of seat. Presently the Governor said:

"Mr. Clemens, I was a fellow citizen of yours in Buffalo a good many months, a good while ago, and during those months you burst suddenly into a mighty fame, out of a previous long-continued and no doubt proper obscurity—but I was a nobody, and you wouldn't notice me nor have anything to do with me. But now that I have become somebody, you have changed your style, and you come here to shake hands with me and be sociable. How do you explain this kind of conduct?"

"Oh," I said, "it is very simple, your Excellency. In Buffalo

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

you were nothing but a sheriff. I was in society. I couldn't afford to associate with sheriffs. But you are a Governor now, and you are on your way to the Presidency. It is a great difference, and it makes you worth while."

There appeared to be about sixteen doors to that spacious room. From each door a young man now emerged, and the sixteen lined up and moved forward and stood in front of the Governor with an aspect of respectful expectancy in their attitude. No one spoke for a moment. Then the Governor said:

"You are dismissed, gentlemen. Your services are not required. Mr. Clemens is sitting on the bells."

There was a cluster of sixteen bell buttons on the corner of the table; my proportions at that end of me were just right to enable me to cover the whole of that nest, and that is how I came to hatch out those sixteen clerks.

In accordance with the suggestion made in Gilder's letter recently received I have written the following note to ex-President Cleveland upon his sixty-ninth birthday:

HONORED SIR:—

Your patriotic virtues have won for you the homage of half the nation and the enmity of the other half. This places your character as a citizen upon a summit as high as Washington's. The verdict is unanimous and unassailable. The votes of both sides are necessary in cases like these, and the votes of the one side are quite as valuable as are the votes of the other. Where the votes are all in a man's favor the verdict is against him. It is sand, and history will wash it away. But the verdict for you is rock, and will stand.

S. L. CLEMENS.

As of date March 18, 1906. . . .

In a diary which Mrs. Clemens kept for a little while, a great many years ago, I find various mentions of Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, who was a near neighbor of ours in Hartford, with no fences between. And in those days she made as much use of our grounds as of her own, in pleasant weather. Her mind had decayed, and she was a pathetic figure. She wandered about all the day long in the care of a muscular Irishwoman. Among the colonists of our neighborhood the doors always stood open in pleasant weather. Mrs. Stowe entered them at her own free will, and as she was always softly slippered and generally full of animal spirits, she was able to deal in surprises, and she liked to do it. She would slip up behind a person who was deep in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dreams and musings and fetch a war-whoop that would jump that person out of his clothes. And she had other moods. Sometimes we would hear gentle music in the drawing-room and would find her there at the piano singing ancient and melancholy songs with infinitely touching effect.

Her husband, old Professor Stowe, was a picturesque figure. He wore a broad slouch hat. He was a large man, and solemn. His beard was white and thick and hung far down on his breast. The first time our little Susy ever saw him she encountered him on the street near our house and came flying wide-eyed to her mother and said, "Santa Claus has got loose!"

Which reminds me of Rev. Charley Stowe's little boy—a little boy of seven years. I met Rev. Charley crossing his mother's grounds one morning and he told me this little tale. He had been out to Chicago to attend a Convention of Congregational clergymen, and had taken his little boy with him. During the trip he reminded the little chap, every now and then, that he must be on his very best behavior there in Chicago. He said: "We shall be the guests of a clergyman, there will be other guests—clergymen and their wives—and you must be careful to let those people see by your walk and conversation that you are of a godly household. Be very careful about this." The admonition bore fruit. At the first breakfast which they ate in the Chicago clergyman's house he heard his little son say in the meekest and most reverent way to the lady opposite him,

"Please, won't you, for Christ's sake, pass the butter?"

MARK TWAIN.

(To be Continued.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GOSPEL OF WEALTH.—II.

BY ANDREW CARNEGIE.

THE problem of wealth will not down. It is obviously so unequally distributed that the attention of civilized man must be attracted to it from time to time. He will ultimately enact the laws needed to produce a more equal distribution. It is again foremost in the public mind to-day.

We have evidence of this in the President's recent speech (April 14th, 1906), in which he gives direct and forcible expression to public sentiment. We quote:

> "It is important to this people to grapple with the problems connected with the amassing of enormous fortunes, and the use of those fortunes, both corporate and individual, in business. We should discriminate in the sharpest way between fortunes well won and fortunes ill won; between those gained as an incident to performing great services to the community as a whole, and those gained in evil fashion by keeping just within the limits of mere law-honesty. Of course, no amount of charity in spending such fortunes in any way compensates for misconduct in making them. As a matter of personal conviction, and without pretending to discuss the details or formulate the system, I feel that we shall ultimately have to consider the adoption of some such scheme as that of a progressive tax on all fortunes beyond a certain amount, either given in life or devised or bequeathed upon death to any individual—a tax so framed as to put it out of the power of the owner of one of these enormous fortunes to hand on more than a certain amount to any one individual; the tax, of course, to be imposed by the national and not the State government. Such taxation should, of course, be aimed merely at the inheritance or transmission in their entirety of those fortunes swollen beyond all healthy limits."

It is seventeen years since THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW published "Wealth," written by the writer (republished September 21st, 1906), which strongly urged graduated taxation of estates at death of possessors as the easiest and best mode of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

insuring for the community a just share of great fortunes. He is in full accord with the President's views, as quoted, upon this vital question. Continued study has only confirmed him in his conviction of their justice, their beneficent effect upon society, and their necessity in the not-distant future. Much has been written of a contrary character. Graduated taxation has been denounced as unjust and Socialistic, fatal to Individualism and sure to sap the springs of enterprise. If the writer thought it favorable to Socialism or Communism, or in the least degree opposed to Individualism, he would be the last to favor it, for of nothing is he more fully convinced than that in Individualism lies the secret of the steady progress of civilization. Except we build upon the foundation of "As ye sow so shall ye reap," we labor in vain to establish a higher, or even to maintain the present, civilization. Virtue must bring reward, vice punishment, work wages, sloth misery. Energy and skill must win a prize denied to indolence and ignorance. He who sows the wind must reap the whirlwind.

The rights of private property emerged slowly from ages when property was held mostly in common; as civilization advanced men became less communistic and more individualistic. Public sentiment at last sustained private property because it was found favorable, and discarded Communism because it was found unfavorable, to progress; but there is nothing sacred about individual ownership except as man has established it as the system under which progress can be made. There is no cause to fear, therefore, that man is ever to turn round and creep backward toward the barbarism from which he has finally emerged. The law of evolution forbids, for his march is upward. Should he go too far in assessing wealth, he will inevitably reverse his action and adopt that policy which is best for the general good.

First, as to the justice of taxing large fortunes left at death upon a graduated scale for the benefit of the community. Graduated taxes are no new feature. Britain long since adopted them. They are advocated by no less an authority than Adam Smith, who says, "The subjects of every state ought to contribute to the support of government as nearly as possible in proportion to their respective abilities."

Let us go to the root of the matter and inquire how these fortunes are created, from whence and how they arise.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Imagine an honest hard-working farmer who finds himself able to give to each of his two sons a farm. They have married admirable young women of the neighborhood, of good kith and kin, friends from youth,—no mistake about their virtues. The sons find farms, one in the centre of Manhattan Island, the other beyond the Harlem. They cast lots for the farms as the fairest method, thus letting the fates decide. Neither has a preference. The Harlem farm falls to the elder, the Manhattan to the younger. Mark now the problem of wealth, how it develops.

A few hundred dollars buy the farms, and the loving brothers set out for themselves. They are respected by all; loved by their intimates. To the extent of their means, they are liberal contributors to all good causes, and especially to the relief of neighbors who through exceptional troubles need friendly aid and counsel. They are equally industrious, cultivate their farms equally well and in every respect are equally good citizens of the state. Their children grow up and are educated together.

The growth of New York City northwards soon makes the children of the younger millionaires, while those of the elder remain simple farmers in comfortable circumstances, but still of the class who, fortunate in this beyond their cousins, have to perform some service to their fellows and thus earn a livelihood.

Now, who or what made this difference in wealth? Not labor, not skill. No, nor superior ability, sagacity, nor enterprise, nor greater public service. The Community created the millionaire's wealth. While he slept, it grew as fast as when he was awake. It would have arisen exactly as it did had he been on the Harlem and his brother on the Manhattan farm.

The younger farmer, now a great property-holder, dies and his children in due time pass away, each leaving millions, since the farm has become part of a great city, and immense buildings upon it produce annual rents of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

When these children die, who have neither toiled nor spun, what canon of justice would be violated were the nation to step in and say that, since the aggregation of their fellow men called "the community" created the decedent's wealth, it is entitled to a large portion of it as they pass away. The community has refrained from exacting any part during their lives. The heirs have been allowed to enjoy it all, because although in their case the wealth was a purely communal growth, yet in other cases

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wealth often comes largely from individual effort and ability, and hence it is better for the community to allow such ability to remain in charge of fortune-making, because most likely to succeed, and in so doing develop our country's resources.

It would be unwise to interfere with the working bees; better allow them to continue gathering honey during their lives. When they die, the nation should have a large portion of the honey remaining in the hives; it is immaterial at what date collection is made, so that it comes to the National Treasury at last.

In a prosperous country, increasing rapidly in population, like our own, by far the greatest amount of wealth created in any department comes from enhanced values of real property.

The Census shows that from 1890 to 1900 the value of Real Estate increased from $39,544,544,333 to $52,537,628,164—an increase of $12,993,083,831.

The obvious creator of this wealth is not the individual but the community, as we see in the case of the two brother farmers. Property may pass through many proprietors, each paying more for it than his predecessor; but whether each succeeding owner sells to his successor at a profit depends almost solely upon whether the surrounding population increases. Let population remain stationary and so do values of property. Let it decline, and values fall even more rapidly. In other words, increased population—the community—creates the wealth in each successive generation. Decrease of population reduces it, and this law holds in the whole of that vast and greatest field of wealth, Real Estate. In no other field is the making of wealth so greatly dependent upon the community, so little upon the owner, who may wholly neglect it without injury. Therefore no other form of wealth should contribute to the nation so generously.

Let us now trace the acquisition of wealth by the active business man who has some personal part, and often not a small one, in creating it.

Imagine four brothers, sons of another hard-working farmer. The first settles in New York City, the second in Pittsburgh, the third in Chicago and the fourth in Montana. The first sees that railroads in every direction are essential to the coming Metropolis and devotes himself to this field, obtains large interests therein; and, as the population of the country increases and that of New York City bounds ahead into the millions, these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lines of transport laden with traffic justify increasing bonded debt. Having the figures under his eye, he sees that the shares of these railways are sure to become dividend-paying, that even already there are surplus earnings beyond the bonded interest, which, if not needed for pressing extensions, could be paid in dividends and make the stock par. He strains his credit, borrows great sums, buys the shares when prices are low, and, floating upon a tidal wave of swelling prosperity, caused by the increased traffic of rapidly increasing communities, he soon becomes a multi-millionaire and at his death his children are all left millionaires. In the consolidation of the various short lines into one great whole there was margin for a stupendous increase of capital; and in other collateral fields there lay numerous opportunities for profitable exploitation, all, however, dependent upon an expanding population for increased values. Now, while the founder of the family must be credited with remarkable ability and with having done the state some service in his day and generation, it cannot be denied that the chief creator of his wealth was the increasing communities along the railroads, which gave the traffic that lifted these lines into dividend-payers upon a capital far beyond the actual cost of the property.

In the work and its profits the nation was an essential partner and equally entitled with the individual to share in the dividends.

The second son is so fortunate as to settle in Pittsburgh when it has just been discovered that some of the coal-fields of which it is the centre produced a coking-coal admirably adapted for iron-ore smelting. Another vein easily mined proved a splendid steam-coal. Small iron-mills soon sprang up. Everything indicated that here was indeed the future iron city, where steel could be produced more cheaply than in any other location in the world. Naturally, his attention was turned in this direction. He wooed the genius of the place. This was not anything extraordinarily clever. It was in the air. He is entitled to credit for having abiding faith in the future of his country and of steel, and for risking with his young companions not only all he had, which was little or nothing, but all they could induce timid bankers to lend from time to time. He and his partners built mills and furnaces, and finally owned a large concern making millions yearly. This son and his partners looked ahead. They

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

visited other lands and noted conditions, and finally concluded that a large supply of raw materials was the key to permanent prosperity. Accordingly, they bought or leased many mines of iron ore, many thousands of acres of coal and of limestone and also of natural-gas territory, and at last had for many long years a full supply of all the minerals required to produce iron and steel. This was wise policy, but it did not require genius, only intelligent study and good judgment, to see that. They did not produce these minerals; they saw them lying around open for sale at prices that are now deemed only nominal. Much of the wealth of the concern came from these minerals which were once the public property of the community, and were easily secured by this fortunate son and his partners upon trifling royalties.

Their venture was made profitable by the demand for their products, iron and steel, from the expanding population engaged in settling a new continent. Without new populous communities far and near, no milliondom was possible for them. The increasing population was always the important factor in their success. Why should the Nation be denied participation in the results when the gatherers cease to gather and a division has to be made?

The third son was attracted to Chicago, and quite naturally became an employee in a meat-packing concern, in which he soon made himself indispensable. A small interest in the business was finally won by him, and he rose in due time to millionairedom, just as the population of the country swelled. If Chicago to-day, and our country generally, had only the population of early days, there could have been no great fortune for the third son. Here, as before, it was the magnitude of the business, based solely upon the wants of the population, that swelled the yearly profits and produced prodigious fortunes.

The fourth son, attracted by the stories of Hecla and Calumet, and other rich mines which "far surpass the wealth of Ormus or of Ind," settled in Montana and was lucky after some years of rude experience. His ventures gave him the coveted millionairedom. The amount of copper and silver required by the teeming population of the country and of other lands kept prices high, and hence his enormous profits mined from land for which only a trifle was paid to the General Government not so long ago.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He did not create his wealth; he only dug it out of the mine as the demands of the people gave value to the previously worthless stones. Here especially we cannot but feel that the people who created the value should share the dividends when these must pass into other hands.

The fifth son had a melancholy career. He settled in New York City while young and unfortunately began his labors in a stock-broker's office, where he soon became absorbed in the fluctuations of the Exchange, while his fond mother proudly announced to all she met that he "was in business." From this the step was easy to taking chances with his small earnings. His gambling ventures proved successful. It was an era of rising values, and he soon acquired wealth without increasing values, for speculation is the parasite of business feeding upon values, creating none. A few years and the feverish life of the gamester told upon him. He was led into a scheme to corner a certain stock, and, as was to have been expected, he found that men who will conspire to entrap others will not hesitate to deceive their partners upon occasion if sure it will pay and safe from exposure. He ended his life by his own hand. His end serves to keep his brothers resolute in the resolve never to gamble. The speculator seldom leaves a millionaire's fortune, unless he breaks down or passes away when his ventures are momentarily successful. In such a case, his ill-gotten gold should be levied upon by the state at the highest rate of all, even beyond that imposed upon Real Estate values. Wealth is often, we may say generally, accumulated in such manner as benefits the nation in the process; here the means employed demoralizes the getter as well as the people, and lowers the standard of ethics. It is taken without returning any valid consideration.

There is one class of millionaires whose wealth in very much greater degree than others may be credited to themselves. Graham Bell of the telephone, Edison of numerous inventions, Westinghouse of the air-brake, and others, who originated or first applied processes hitherto unused, and were sufficiently alive to their pecuniary interests to hold large shares in the companies formed to develop and introduce them to the public. Their wealth had its origin in their own inventive brains. All honor to the inventor! He stands upon a higher platform than the others.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It may be said that in greater or less degree our leading manufacturers, railroad-builders, department-store projectors, meat-packers, and other specialists in one line or other had to adopt new methods; and, with few, if any, exceptions, there can be traced in their careers some special form of ability upon which their success depended, thus distinguishing them from the mass of competitors. No doubt this is correct, yet the inventions or processes used were the work of others, so that all they did was to introduce new methods of management or to recognize and utilize opportunities. This the inventor class have also done if they have become millionaires, but in addition they have invented the new processes. So that these deserve to reap beyond the other class, yet only in degree, because both classes alike depend upon increasing population—the masses, who require, or consume, the article produced, so that even the inventor's wealth is in great part dependent upon the community which uses his productions.

It is difficult to understand why, at the death of its possessor, great wealth, gathered or created in any of these or in other forms, should not be shared by the community which has been the most potent cause or partner of all in its creation. We have seen that enormous fortunes are dependent upon the community; without great and increasing population, there could be no great wealth. Where wealth accrues honorably, the people are always silent partners.

It is not denied that the great administrator, whether as railroad-builder, steamship-owner, manufacturer, merchant, banker, is an exceptional man, or that millions honestly made in any useful occupation give evidence of ability, foresight, and assiduity above the common and prove the man who has made them a valuable member of society. In no wise, therefore, should such men be unduly hampered or restricted as long as they are spared. After all, they can absorb comparatively little; and, generally speaking, the money-making man, in contrast to his heirs, who generally become members of the smart or fast set, is abstemious, retiring and little of a spendthrift. The millionaire himself is probably the least expensive bee in the industrial hive, taking into account the amount of honey he gathers and what he consumes.

An Income Tax is sometimes proposed as one of the best possible modes of correcting the uneven distribution of wealth, but of all taxes this is the most pernicious. It demoralizes a nation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Gladstone, one of the greatest financial ministers, advocated its abolition in Britain, alleging that it made a "Nation of Liars." During the Civil War, we had such a tax and paid it loyally, but public sentiment demanded its repeal and it was the first tax remitted when war ceased—justly so because it penalized the honest citizen. Its imposition would be strenuously opposed unless it were graduated and the exemption line placed high, so that the tax should be restricted to the few enormous fortunes. The Supreme Court has declared such a tax to be unconstitutional. No great gain would result to the state from it compared to what would accrue from the easier plan of exacting heavy taxes at death. The date of collection matters little, so that the payment is certain at last. Such proportions can be exacted as are deemed proper from time to time, unless it is generally agreed that great wealth at last pays its fair share to the people of the Nation, who were so highly instrumental in creating it or from whom it was gathered.

The collection of an Income Tax would require a large trained body of permanent officials to collect from indignant, discontented people, naturally resenting intrusive inquiries regarding their private affairs. The honest would always pay, the dishonest would usually escape. Much better that Corporations should be required to pay a dividend tax to the Nation which would be really a tax upon Incomes. It is by doing so that Britain realizes such enormous sums from its Income Tax. Were she to attempt to collect these direct from each individual, it would be found much less productive. So should we find if we made the attempt. There is no reason for so doing. Every dividend-paying Corporation can be made the rigid collector of Income Tax for the Government.

It is clearly at the rich man's death that the community should exact a large share of estate, a graduated share, increasing in proportion to its extent. It should be paid over to the Government and applied to the service of the people, the silent but contributive partner from whom it has been so largely derived. The graduated death duties exacted by Britain might guide us in the beginning. The maximum assessment upon estates to the lineal successors is eight per cent. upon the valuation, but to distant legatees it is very much higher. Smaller estates pay less in proportion.

Such contributions from the owners of enormous fortunes at death would do much to reconcile dissatisfied but fair-minded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people to the alarmingly unequal distribution of wealth arising from the new industrial conditions of our day and the era of unprecedented prosperity our country has enjoyed for years.

The millionaire himself should rejoice at the thought of being a useful laborer in the national vineyard and in knowing that his contribution to the general fund at death will lessen the drain upon the scanty resources of his less successful fellows. Wealth left at death seldom does better service than this.

The people see how equivocally in many cases, how unfairly in others, fortunes have been made. Especially have the numerous failures of prominent men in official position to perform their duties properly deeply impressed them, and produced a strong feeling of antagonism to wealth and millionaires as a class. The appeal to them in the June number of this REVIEW should not pass unheeded. As wealth comes mainly from the community, it should be administered as a sacred trust, by the temporary recipient, for the public good. Property in one sense is a mere creature of the law. Whether the holder be permitted to bequeath it to his successors and to what extent and how, are simply questions of policy for the people through the Government to determine. France has long restricted it. Our States generally designate the widow's share. There is here no question of right or wrong, but simply one of policy,—what is best in all respects for the nation.

Fortunes have recently been more easily made with us than ever, both in number and amount, with the inevitable result that sudden wealth is bound to produce in a new land, which, not so long ago, was much freer from immense fortunes than the older lands of Europe. Millionaires are a recent growth in the Republic. Multi-millionaires were unheard of before our day.

Some sixty-odd years ago, Britain, then in the beginning of the speculative period of railroad construction and manufacturing supremacy, had a somewhat similar experience. Greater fortunes were made than ever before; but the makers, imbued with the aristocratic ambition to become great landowners and county magnates, were soon absorbed into that class. They regarded wealth only as a means to an end,—entrance to the aristocratic and fashionable circle. This refuge new millionaires lack under our democratic system, hence the vulgar, extravagant and offensive character of the follies to which they are driven, that evoke

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so much adverse criticism from people of education, good sense, and quiet respectable living, with whom mere dollars count for little. Funds collected by the Government from the estates of the millionaires at death would never be likely otherwise to be put to so good a use as the payment of Government expenditures, relieving the people in part from the burden of taxation.

We are yet as a nation in the heyday of youth. In time we shall tone down and live simpler lives and create different standards. Wealth will be dethroned as higher tastes prevail, its pursuit become less absorbing and less esteemed, and, above all, the mere man of wealth himself will come to realize that in the estimation of those of wisest judgment he has no place with the educated, professional man. He occupies a distinctly lower plane intellectually, and in the coming day Brain is to stand above Dollars, Conduct above both. The making of money as an aim will then be rated as an ignoble ambition. No man has ever secured recognition, much less fame, from mere wealth. It confers no distinction among the good or the great.

Meanwhile, as the masses become more intelligent, they may be expected to criticise and denounce the growth of fortunes which fail to contribute largely to the public good, and finally to insist that they shall be made to do so. The first step to this end should be heavy graduated death taxes upon wealth, in pursuance of Adam Smith's dictum already quoted.

Indications of alarm are sometimes seen regarding present conditions. Fears are expressed that a war of classes may arise. On the contrary, there are none but healthful signs in the awakening intelligence and deep interest of the masses in this problem. Its final solution upon right lines cannot but place the body politic in a much better position than before.

The American people can be trusted to deal with improper methods of business and excessive wealth accumulations wisely and well, to the advantage of the Nation, as they have met and solved other pressing problems, some of which for a time were thought by many likely to cause serious trouble, whereas the commotion only indicated that another step nearer the light was about to be taken. So will it be with this new problem of regulating, as needed, both corporations and individuals, that there may be fairer acquisition and fairer distribution of wealth.

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS THE UNITED STATES A WORLD POWER?

BY IGNOTUS.

THE San Francisco incident is a capital illustration of the justness of the assertion that the United States is a "World Power," and thus entitled to sit at the international table where the interesting, the fruitful and, sometimes, the dangerous game of diplomacy is played. Once more, but this time most curiously and even searchingly, the Powers that are able to redeem their pledges, or that may be compelled to redeem them, are studying this conglomerate of sovereignties that insists upon calling itself sovereign.

What are the admitted facts, so far as they bear upon the question to which our curiosity, and indeed our interests, seek an answer? These facts do not necessarily include all which go to the merits of the controversy which Japan has raised with the United States, and in which there may, or may not, be an injection of malice, a touch of Oriental cunning, a wicked desire to claim what would not be allowed at The Hague, but which might be enforced on a field where Japan has recently met with a success of the splendor and completeness of which the Oriental Island Empire and her people are justly proud. But we are not now concerned with the motives of Japan, nor even, in essence, with the alleged treaty obligation, nor with the Japanese claim as a claim, but simply and solely with the question of the power of the United States, a question that has been made pertinent by this incident. What, then, are the admitted and the pertinent facts?

In a brief special despatch from Tokio which was printed in the New York *Sun* of October 21st, we read of an intense excitement in Japan which was said to be due to the "exclusion of Japanese children from the public schools of California, John

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

D. Rockefeller's utterances on Japan's commercial treachery, and Congressman Kahn's bellicose threats coupled with the declaration that Japan is unprepared for a fight." There was so much that was grotesque in these asserted causes of international wrath that the despatch was properly presented in an inconspicuous column and in a subordinate place in that column. But on the following day there was published another despatch from Tokio; and this time it became evident that the Japanese mind, or at least the Japanese newspaper mind, was excited by reason of the alleged "exclusion of Japanese children from the public schools of California." The other causes were dropped. It was now stated that the Japanese Government considered the "situation as extremely dangerous." The Japanese Government sought, indirectly, of course, and through the agency of its press, to put itself in an intelligent, and, therefore, the right position for the contest, diplomatic or other, which might be coming on. It admitted that the trouble was purely local, but began to intimate that niceties of distinction between the National and State Governments of the United States would not be patiently listened to, or even understood, by the people with whom the Government had to reckon. Thus early the suggestion was thrown out, unofficially, that the United States would do well to repudiate the anti-Japanese sentiment which had so roused the wrath of the "child-loving nation."

It turned out that this sentiment was even more local than had been asserted in these Tokio despatches. The action complained of was really that of the San Francisco Board of Education and not that of the State of California, and the Board had not excluded Japanese from the schools, but had directed that they and all other Oriental children be taught, not with white children, but in separate schools. So the excitement in Japan was due to the action of a city, and not of one of those greater divisions which citizens of older World Powers may regard as United States counties.

So far we had no official assertion or representation by Japan. Nevertheless, the Government of the United States became strangely disturbed. It may be pardonable to observe that its activity was of that kind which is indulged in by both Governments and persons who realize their powerlessness to meet a possible situation which they dread or foresee. The despatches from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington informed us, "with much emphasis," that "the members of the Federal Administration, from the President down, have no sympathy whatever with the discrimination against the Japanese, or the attempts to stir up opposition to them." These official gentlemen were said to be of the solemn opinion that the agitation was "ill advised." The fear was expressed, still in official circles, be it understood, that Congress would enact a law "placing the Japanese upon the same basis as Chinese who desire to enter the country." What could this mean? Those who perform the public tasks of the ancient "World Powers" could understand how a cynical great nation might take away by legislation the rights of unresisting Chinese, but is there any Power in the world which would undertake so to deal with Japan —Japan, fresh from its triumph over Russia; Japan, whose mighty navy is so near to the undefended Asiatic frontier of the United States? Although the international law which the United States professes is very different from that which is practised by the older nations of Europe and Asia, no one who had long sat at the international table could believe her capable of such a folly.

And yet the Washington despatches asserted that there might be passed an exclusion law which would deprive Japanese of treaty rights, and that President Roosevelt could interpose nothing but his veto. What an incredible assertion! A statute can repeal a treaty! The legislature of a "World Power" can break the solemn international engagement entered into by the authority whose duty it is to speak for the nation in its dealings with other nations! How can the Powers which are able to keep their promises, to pay their stakes, regard with equanimity the entrance into the game of one that may slip under the table the moment he is called upon to pay his losses?

But let us proceed with the examination of the perturbation of the United States Government when it heard that the Government of Japan was concerned by the excitement of its people, and that it was manifesting that calm politeness which, when shown by a self-respecting man or Government, so often denotes alarming readiness for a fight rather than eagerness for peace. Instead of exhibiting an amiable haste to avoid real trouble, a haste which would have indicated that diplomatic errors would not be permitted to bring on war, since there could be no dispo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sition anywhere to take advantage of such errors, the Japanese Government seemed to seasoned diplomats to be carefully establishing proof that no display of ill-temper by itself had precipitated a conflict. On the other hand, it seemed to the same observers, cynical and unfriendly, if you will, but almost brutally impartial in discussing the troubles of others, as if the Government of the United States was so irrationally nervous that it was clearly attempting to avoid an awkward situation over which it would have no control, but for which it might be held wholly responsible. Indeed, it was stated that the Administration "finds itself powerless to prevent misunderstanding in the present crisis in its relations with Japan." Veiled threats came to it from persons in "high position" in Japan. A Japanese boycott of American goods, more serious than that of the Chinese merchants, was suggested. An attempt was made to arouse the fears of the Eastern part of the United States for the ill results that might come to it on account of the manifestations of harshness and animosity against the Japanese by the people of the Pacific coast. Seemingly inspired despatches from Washington pleaded with Japan to remember the friendly sentiments of the United States for Japan in its war with Russia, and American services to prevent the partition of China among the Powers of Europe. It was a sad spectacle for the friends of the United States, that of this new-born "World Power" begging Japan to be kind; for this sort of thing is only resorted to *in extremis*. It is still the barbarian habit of the Powers to forget all friendships, and ignore the finer sentiments when these stand in the way of their designs, which, it may be admitted, are often far from righteous.

On the 24th, Washington found a grain of comfort in the fact that Japan had made no official representation, had as yet taken no official notice of the wrong done to her "little children." This was thought to be evidence that the Tokio Government understood the situation, realized that the United States was powerless to redress wrongs inflicted upon foreigners by a State, or by any inferior county, or by a city, while it was hoped that it also indicated that Japan would not exact the utmost, would not expose the frailty of her neighbor in the East, or take advantage of the "World Power" which was the easiest of all prey to the Japanese navy and army.

The next fact in the procession of events brought deep disap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pointment to Washington. Japan took official notice of the San Francisco affair. To this time it had not appeared that Japan claimed that her treaty rights had been violated. The excitement of her people was apparently caused by the unfriendliness of the act of the San Francisco Board of Education. No legal obligation had been denied by the United States or by any part thereof. But, while this unfriendliness was an expression of race dislike, and might not break the law of nations, unlike the Chinese boycott it was a political act and the offenders constituted a political, or governing, body. Now, on the 25th of October, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Root, learned from the Viscount Aoki, the Japanese Ambassador, that his Government asserted that the "treaty rights of the Japanese in the United States had been infringed upon."

For the purposes of this exposition of the *affaire* San Francisco, as it has come to be called in the chancelleries, we must confine ourselves to the admission by the authorities of the United States that the Japanese Ambassador's representation was well founded, and that the children of Japanese in this country had the right by treaty with the United States to attend not only the public schools of the country, but the same schools as were attended by the children of native Americans; that the United States had agreed with Japan that there should be no discrimination in this respect either for or against the Japanese. Even if there were no such treaty right, it was clear that the Government of the United States did not care to discuss the question, or claim the advantage of a misplay. It seemed simply intent on assuring the Japanese Government that it regretted the incident; that it had no power to change or annul the order of the San Francisco school authorities; but that it would exert its influence, possibly sufficient, to secure from San Francisco action that would satisfy, perhaps gratify, the Government at Tokio and its people. We are not, however, dealing with the treaty of 1894. We are content to accept the views reputed to be held by both Governments and seemingly shared by the press of the United States, and by the Governments and press of Great Britain and of France. Moreover, according to a San Francisco despatch of the 26th of October, a United States judge issued an order directed to the Board of Education of San Francisco. This order was based on the theory that the exclusion of Japanese pupils

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the public schools was "in violation of the Constitution of the United States and also in violation of a treaty now existing between the United States and the Empire of Japan." We are dealing with the situation made by the general admission that Japanese children were possessed of the right to attend the public schools of California; that this right had been granted by the United States in a treaty the provisions of which gave to the United States consideration for its promise in the form of engagements on the part of Japan to grant what were regarded as reciprocal privileges to the people of this country; and that this treaty had been violated in the manner already indicated by a political body performing tasks of government in the United States.

Such was the situation as it appeared to those sitting around the international table on the 26th of October, after they had read of their colleague Aoki's representation to the American Secretary of Foreign Affairs. They looked, then, at their fellow "World Power" to see what it would do.

It is but simple justice to Mr. Root to say that he evinced his consciousness of the perplexity and awkwardness of the American situation by expressions of the deepest concern. Aoki told him that he and his Government understood—to use an expression which to a federal republican may seem harsh, but which to a monarchist must be true—the imbecility to which the Washington Government was reduced by its constitutional law. The Japanese Government understood that the affair was local, but the "people at home would misunderstand the situation." A feeble effort was made to complicate the question by allusions to the invasion of a seal-rookery by Japanese fishermen in violation of American treaty rights, but the allusion was not noticed, because Japan had no idea of permitting a diversion of attention from a situation in which, as Mr. Root himself recognized, she held the commanding position. Mr. Root finally determined that "something must be done," and the foreign observers expected that the United States would at once take steps to carry out its admitted promises, and to teach the intrusive local authorities their proper place in the government of the nation.

What was their surprise, however, to read, in a striking headline on the morning of the 27th: "Roosevelt acts for Japan. Moves to Protect Her Treaty Rights in California." Here was,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

indeed, an astonishing assertion. The President of the United States was going to protect Japan against the assaults upon its own law by a public body of the United States. It would be his duty, of course, so to protect Japan from the breaking of the promises of his own Government, but how was he to set about it? Would he order the local authority to rescind its illegal action? Its order was illegal according to the admitted treaty rights and obligations of the two countries. A treaty is a law. In the United States it is made by the Constitution the supreme law of the land. In any country a treaty is a law and affects the relations of its citizens to foreigners and to its own Government, which is charged with the duty of enforcing the law. If the Japanese children had by treaty the right to attend the public schools, the action of the Board of Education of San Francisco was illegal; it was a violation of the law of the United States; it was, therefore, as it was performed wilfully, consciously, with intent to act in opposition to the treaty of the United States, a defiance of the Washington Government. How would the President act? How would he proceed to protect the other party to the international compact from this violation of the provisions of law which he must execute? Any of the really strong Governments which, to use an Americanism of the part of the country with which the President is supposed to be most familiar, were "sitting in the game," would have taken summary and effective action. They are not only "World Powers," but they possess and habitually exercise power over their domestic affairs. No subordinate division of any such Power would dream of infringing a law or a treaty of the general Government unless it were ready to resort to rebellion, and to an ultimate test of strength. But what did the President of the new "World Power" do in order that its promise to another Power might not be shattered by a local school board? Did he issue an order to the offenders? No; he acted for Japan by directing Secretary Metcalf, report says because he is a Californian, to go to San Francisco and to try to persuade the local authorities to rescind their action and to obey the law of the United States. It was stated in a Washington despatch that the "President wants mainly to emphasize that his interest in the situation is great enough to justify sending one of his own Cabinet to the scene." This is an extraordinary statement. The ruler of any other Power would have had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sufficient interest in any attempt by one of his local authorities to break one of his treaty promises to go himself to the scene, and, if necessary, to take force with him. But, after all, it is quite impossible to imagine such a situation in any Power whose treaties are effective, in whose central authority alone lies the power of keeping, or of breaking, international agreements. It would be strange, indeed, if the President were not interested in a situation the ultimate terms of which may be expressed by armies and navies. What is strange is that he should consider it worth while to express an interest. Such an expression naturally raises a doubt as to his ability to make his interest effective. This doubt was emphasized by the statement that Secretary Metcalf was "directed to confer with the Governor, the acting Mayor of San Francisco, the Japanese Consul, the school authorities and all others who might be able to throw light on the anti-Japanese situation and report to the President the exact conditions and the basis of the sentiment which served to bring about the discrimination against Japanese subjects."

This ambassador of the President accredited to the local authorities of San Francisco was to warn these recreant public servants that their conduct was likely to disturb the friendly relations of the United States and Japan, and to "endanger the commercial interests of the United States, not only in Japan but in China and elsewhere in the Far East." Secretary Metcalf was diplomatically to make the San-Franciscans realize the danger which lurked "in giving offence to Japan, and also the moral obligation which rests upon the Federal Government and its citizens to respect the treaty rights of the Japanese, who are assured of freedom from discrimination while residing within the borders of the country."

The Government which feels obliged to confine itself to persuasion, to exerting its influence, to appeals to its citizens, especially its official citizens, to be law-abiding, instead of compelling obedience to its laws, is a comical kind of "World Power." It may be that this Government may be able to raise troops and money; it may, according to the once-popular English Jingo tune, have the ships, the men and the money too, but, if it be a real "World Power," it ought to be able to prevent a war as well as to fight one when it can no longer be prevented. It ought to be able to prevent any of its citizens, certainly, from giving

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause for war by violating the treaty rights, or the rights recognized by international law, of a foreign people, or to punish those who do offend to the satisfaction of the offended state. It ought to be able to do this by its courts, or, if necessary, by its force. Its assertion that it is a "World Power" is ridiculous if it cannot act directly and immediately upon the sinning citizens, official or other. If it cannot compel all who dwell within its borders to keep the law embodied in one of its treaties, it is certainly a strange and unsafe partner in the international game. What Power would make an alliance with it for mutual aid in time of war, if an irresponsible School Board, or County Board, or State government, or a still more irresponsible mob, might precipitate a conflict of arms against the tearful pleadings of the Federal Government? It has been observed, by the way, by foreigners who also are studying the phenomena of government, that it is, say, temperamental in American publicists to speak of the central power as federal when a national obligation is to be avoided, and to emphasize its national character whenever its power is to be proclaimed. In the *affaire* San Francisco we hear exclusively of the Federal Government.

The President sent Secretary Metcalf to beg citizens of the United States, citizens holding public office, not to endanger the peace and commerce of the country by breaking its treaty. The head-lines quoted above assert that the President intended to protect the treaty rights of Japan, but how much more is it necessary for the United States to protect its own honor, its own promises, against the assaults of its own people? Can any nation be a "World Power" that is not a power at home? The real "World Power" does not, hat in hand, beg its citizens to refrain from plunging it into war by doing wrong to its treaty obligations. A real "World Power" would sternly and effectively prevent or punish defiant citizens. To beg its citizens to observe the law is comic, and, in the case of the United States, whom the Old World loves, is sad.

And yet Secretary Metcalf goes to beg the San-Franciscans to be good and law-abiding, to appeal to their better nature by reminding them that "Japan, through the Red Cross, sent more than $100,000 for the relief of San Francisco's earthquake and fire sufferers." To add to the fun of the comedy, it was announced on the 2nd of November that Attorney-General Moody

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had instructed the United States District Attorney in San Francisco to aid, by his advice, perhaps by his presence, the counsel of the Japanese who were to seek, in a court of the United States, an injunction to restrain the local school board from denying to Japanese their treaty rights. Think of it! A "World Power" was ready to help the counsel of foreigners to enforce the "World Power's" law in the "World Power's" own courts. How full of laughter are the cynical onlookers who are familiar with proclamations, naval reviews, after-dinner speeches and editorials!

As one reads the history of the United States in the later years of the eighteenth century, one who has been taught in the school of nations that have long been able to do business with other nations—implying the power to observe their compacts—one wonders that even the mutual jealousies of the colonies could evolve so impotent an instrument of government as the Confederation. Speaking of its treaty-breaking function, an Englishman, the most recent, and perhaps most brilliant, of the many essayists on Alexander Hamilton, says that Congress "made alliances which could and would have been disowned by any State had it discovered a private advantage in the disavowals. When Congress finally came to make peace, the terms which it had agreed to were ignored and repudiated. In the harlequinade of human affairs, no pantaloon ever exercised less discipline and authority." The Constitution was framed in the hope of correcting this feebleness which made of the Confederation a despised bankrupt with which no nation would make a contract, for it was not possessed of power to keep its promise. Has this weakness indeed been corrected? No power in this country but the Federal Government can now make a treaty. No State can enter into a compact with a foreign Power. It is true that the keeping of treaties by the General Government is an invariable virtue, and, therefore, treaties are made with it; but it is also true that if the people of a locality, or the government of a locality, violate the treaty rights of others, the United States Government cannot force obedience to its law, a treaty, nor punish for violation of it. This was revealed in its controversy with Italy which grew out of the murder of Italian subjects in New Orleans. That case differs from the present one because the breach of the treaty rights of the Italians was committed by a mob, whose criminal members the General Government, accord-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing to its own assertions, could not punish. In this instance, the breach of Japanese rights was that of a public official body, whose vicious order the United States cannot annul. Japan, it may be said, should have recalled the Italian incident; and so official Japan does, but the Japanese people know nothing of the constitutional knots which prevent the United States from keeping promises that are distasteful to any section of its citizens, and its voters. They know that their "dear children" have been excluded from schools, and, to them, the United States Government is responsible. Let us suppose a reversal of conditions. If a province of Japan, Sakiado, for instance, should deny to an American citizen his commercial or personal rights, would the people of this country be satisfied with the explanation of its refusing to satisfy the demand of Washington that the Emperor's Government could not redress the grievance of the American citizen because the Emperor had no jurisdiction over Sakiado, could not compel its people, or its local authorities, to observe Japanese treaty obligations? We trow not, unless the Washington Government fears Japan. Sometimes a quarrelsome lad hesitates, and finally refrains from going to extremes. The result of a measurement of the other lad's muscles, sinews and spirit, leads him to think well of peace, perhaps of arbitration. The so-called Great Powers are often like boys. A nation, "World Power" or other, does not make war if it believes that it will be conquered. This would be an impolite observation if he who uttered it had the United States in mind. It is not long since Japan was weak, and the Great Powers were quick to recognize that weakness. An interesting Japanese addressed a letter to the New York *Sun* which was published on the 31st of October. This letter referred to some historic cases similar to that which has been here imagined. From them we see how quick England and America were to respond with arms to the assertion that the Central Government of Japan was unable to compel a province of the nation to redress the grievance of a foreigner, which, the foreigner conceived, was the result of a violation of a national obligation. The first instance, widely known and remembered, was the murder of an English subject who had unwittingly, but sacrilegiously, crossed the processional train of the Daimio of Satsuma. In response to the representations of the British Government, the Shogun's Government stated that it had no power to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compel the Daimio to redress the grievance. Whereupon a British battle-ship was sent to the Daimio's province, and he was compelled to pay money for the satisfaction of the wrong done to the Englishman. The other incident is the firing upon an American war-ship as she passed through the Strait of Shimonoseki. To the polite American admiral who invited the attention of the Shogun's Government to the unfortunate incident, there came the same reply as that which was made to Great Britain in the other affair. Again the irresponsible Daimio, being behind Shogunate irresponsibility, was compelled, by the presence of a combined European and American fleet, to pay money for the exercise in which his gunners had indulged. The third instance is that in which Japan, dealing now with a weaker Power, brought to repentance and humility the Chinese Government which declined responsibility for the outrageous and murderous conduct of some unruly Formosans. The Japanese writer pertinently says:

"The three incidents cited above may prove how disastrous it is for a central government of a country to be unable to control a local government. In the case of the Shogunate government, it was overthrown in a few years after it had proved to be powerless over the local daimiate governments. In the case of the central Chinese Government it had to give an indemnity and a humiliating pledge."

There seems to be a lesson for the new "World Power" in these incidents, and it is a lesson which may fall upon ears not unheeding. Certainly, there ought to be no strutting—perhaps it may be permissible to say, no further strutting—as a "World Power" by a Central Government whose commerce, whose peace, whose law, whose honor are at the mercy of any mob, or of any local authority, which sees fit not only to entertain, but to put in practice, a race prejudice, by violation of the treaty rights of the race that is despised, or whose members are competing with voting labor-unionists. The drum-major of the band is not a fighting unit; he is the swollen and decorated figure of an unserious moment. The nation that takes a seat at the international table may speak of its prowess of the future, if it be so inclined; but it must not only play its cards and pocket its gains; it must be prepared to pay its losses or stand the consequences. A "World Power" that cannot control or account for a mob, or a School Board; that cannot execute its laws or keep its promises,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but must beg to be obeyed! Is this to be the end of the *affaire* San Francisco, as it was of the *affaire* New Orleans?

Is the great Republic once more to pay to a foreign Power a fine imposed upon it for its incompetency to deal with its own citizens who break its treaty pledges? And, if it once more submits to do so, ought it not to reconsider its self-complacent announcement that it is now a "World Power"? Can a nation rise to the proud height of a "World Power" by victory over a decrepit government; and can it retain its lofty seat after it has admitted that it cannot compel the School Board of one of its cities to obey its law?

IGNOTUS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PENDING IMMIGRATION BILLS.

BY ROBERT DE C. WARD.

THE Fifty-ninth Congress has received very general and well-deserved commendation for much excellent legislation enacted by it during its first session, but one of the most important measures of all—the immigration bill—went over, in Conference, to the Short Session. The popular demand for a further regulation of alien immigration found expression in the introduction last winter, into both Senate and House, of an unusually large number of carefully drawn and well-considered immigration bills. These bills, in the usual course of procedure, were referred to the two Committees on Immigration and Naturalization, both of which Committees are composed of an exceptionally competent and representative body of men, including several members who have made a thorough and impartial study of the whole immigration question, and are abundantly qualified to deal with this legislation as experts.

In view of the present state of our knowledge of the immigration question, the Committees felt, as the public generally feels, that the subject has already been thoroughly studied, carefully considered, and exhaustively argued, and that there was no need of delay in perfecting new legislation. The demand for more time; for further hearings; for investigating commissions, and the like, comes from those who are selfishly interested in having conditions continue as at present, and who are even hostile to any immigration regulation whatsoever. To say, as some of these persons have said, that "great harm, injustice and inhumanity" would be done by the bill which passed the Senate last May is preposterous, as is the claim that any measure which has received so large and so general an endorsement is a piece of "class legislation." It is a very striking fact,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and one which should help to settle the minds of those who are honestly in doubt regarding their position on this question, that the bill which came before the House after its passage by the Senate last May embodied practically every one of the new provisions included in the bill already reported to the House by its own Committee on Immigration. This shows that, after careful consideration, the Senate as a whole, and the body of immigration experts on the House committee, had reached practically the same conclusion as to needed legislation.

As the Senate acted first, the Senate bill will be first considered. This bill, S. 4,403, generally known as the Dillingham Bill because it was drawn up and ably supported by the efficient chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration, Senator W. P. Dillingham, of Vermont, passed the Senate, without division, on May 23rd, 1906. Senator Dillingham said in the Senate on May 22nd that this measure, if enacted into law, "will go a long way in the direction of making perfect the already excellent immigration act of 1903."

Section 1 increases the head-money to be paid on alien passengers, except citizens of the United States, Canada, Newfoundland, Mexico and Cuba, from two dollars to five dollars.

This money is paid by the steamship companies, and is simply added to the price of the passage-ticket. The immigrant himself knows nothing of the payment, and it therefore makes no additional "red tape" for him. The head-money is paid into the United States Treasury, forming what is known as the "immigrant fund," and is spent in maintaining the immigration service. An increased head-tax means a larger "immigrant fund," and that means more effective administration of existing laws and better care and protection of the immigrants. Larger and more adequate buildings at existing immigrant stations are very much needed, and new stations, with complete equipment, must be built at New Orleans, Charleston and other ports where immigrants are just beginning to be landed. Furthermore, a larger inspection force is imperatively demanded in order that our immigration officials shall not be obliged, as they now are, to be on duty daily—including Sundays and holidays. The comfort, health and efficiency of these men demand such an increase in the force. It is objected to an increased head-tax that the honesty and character of an immigrant do not depend upon his ability to pay a cer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tain sum of money, and that undesirable persons, criminals, for example, might easily pay the tax. In answer to this objection it need only be pointed out that the higher head-tax is not to be substituted for the other restrictive clauses of existing law; it is to be added to them. Criminals, anarchists, convicts, beggars, paupers, would be excluded, if detected, even if they could pay the larger head-tax. The United States should not be chosen by an immigrant, as it often has been, because it is the cheapest country to go to. It should be selected because it is *the best,* and the best is worth paying for. Higher head-money becomes more necessary as the increasing facilities of land and water transportation make it easier and cheaper to come here. Furthermore, it has been objected to increased head-money that such an increase would debar the worthy and intelligent alien from northern Europe, with a large family, who comes here to settle, while admitting the single alien, who may be far less desirable, from southern Europe or western Asia. The answer to this objection is that, in the pioneer stage of emigration from any country, it is likely that most of those who leave will be men without their families, as is now the case with some of the nations which are beginning to send us large numbers of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe. Later, family immigration increases. This argument is of temporary value only, and has no weight in the general discussion. The argument that it is unfair to an alien who may be debarred from landing to make him lose the additional $3 which a head-tax of $5 would add to his passage rate, is met by the fact that our immigration laws are, or should be, well known abroad. Aliens who are likely to be debarred are probably aware of the possibility of that occurrence in the large majority of cases. They, and the steamship company which brings them over, take the risk of securing a landing, and it cannot be considered an unfair action on the part of the United States to raise the passage rate $3 when the alien himself is undesirable and is debarred by law.

Section 2 adds to the excluded classes:

I. Imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, and epileptics. The Act of March 3rd, 1903, excludes "idiots." Experience has shown that there are a good many immigrants who are certified by our medical inspectors as being "mentally deficient" or "feeble-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minded," and who should certainly be debarred by law. Our best interests demand that no distinction should be made between the idiotic and the feeble-minded or imbecile. The latter are as undesirable additions to our population as the former, and it is as dangerous to add to the American race the children of feeble-minded parents as of idiotic parents. A strong recommendation in favor of this amendment was adopted by the National Immigration Conference at New York last December. Obviously, this provision would affect only a very few aliens, and those of a highly undesirable class.

II. "Persons not comprehended within any of the foregoing excluded classes, who are found to be and are certified by the examining surgeon as being mentally or physically defective, such mental or physical defect being of a nature which may affect the ability of such alien to earn a living." This is one of the more important of the new provisions. In recent years there has come so marked a deterioration in the general physique of the immigrants that it is high time that all aliens of poor physique should be debarred from our shores. When we raise horses, or cattle, or dogs, or sheep, we are careful to select good, strong, healthy stock. If we have any concern for the physical development of our race, we should certainly be no less careful in the selection of our human stock. At the present time, our medical inspectors record thousands of aliens as being of such poor physique that their ability to earn a living is thereby interfered with, yet nearly all of these are admitted because there is no specific clause in our existing immigration law under which they can clearly and surely be excluded.

Our best insurance against race decadence is to be sought in the selection of good stock. We want none but honest, industrious, healthy and fit immigrants. We want them sound in body and sound in mind. We have by law debarred those of unsound mind. Our next step should be to debar those of poor physique. The clause of the Senate bill in the matter of physically unfit and degenerate aliens was carefully drawn, after consultation with the most competent immigration officials. It has commended itself to every one who, having looked at the matter impartially, has publicly expressed an opinion upon it.

No rational or valid argument can be advanced against the exclusion of aliens whose presence here lowers our physical stand-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ards, results in a deterioration of the American race, and adds to the number of our defective and dependent classes. The physical condition of our immigrants is of even more importance than their assimilation. A physical test was urged by the President in his last message, and was recommended by the Immigration Conference. Its adoption has also been strongly urged by the Commissioner-General of Immigration and by the present and former Commissioners of Immigration at New York. A physical test is uniform for all races of incoming aliens. It is not intended and cannot be used to exclude those of any special race. To say, as did a very misleading circular issued during the last Session of Congress, that "any malevolent or narrow-minded medical inspector . . . might be tempted to abuse his power," and exclude large numbers of aliens of some one nationality, is to impute dishonest, unpatriotic and wholly unworthy motives to the able officers of the United States Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service. Our medical inspectors may be trusted in this matter, as we already trust them in the detection and certification of "loathsome or dangerous contagious diseases." They are intelligent, able and honorable men. They will give certificates of "poor physique" only when thoroughly satisfied that all the conditions warrant them in so doing.

III. All children under seventeen years of age, unaccompanied by their parents, unless coming to join parents already in this country who are able to support them, or unless, in the case of death of both parents, they are coming to join brothers or sisters, or uncles or aunts, already in the United States who are willing and able to support them, and will furnish proper security therefor. The object of this clause, the adoption of which has been urged by officials of the Immigration Service, is to put a stop to the importation of alien boys brought here to work under the padrone system.

IV. Those whose passage is paid for, or who are assisted by others to come, unless they prove they do not come within the other excluded classes.

"But this section shall not be held to prevent citizens of the United States, or persons living in the United States who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, or women who have acquired a domicile in the United States, from sending for parents, wife,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

husband, children, grandchildren, brothers, or sisters, or children of deceased brothers and sisters, who are not of the foregoing excluded classes."

For many years Congressional committees have paid attention to what is known as "assisted" immigration, that is, the prepayment of an alien's passage by a relative, or friend, or employer, on this side of the water, or by charitable societies, or local government authorities on the other side. There has always been much evil in assisted immigration. Aliens come here on tickets which are prepaid by distant relatives and friends in the United States who very often fail to support or to care for the newcomers after they have arrived. Employers, likewise, directly or indirectly, encourage the prepayment of passage in order that they may secure cheaper labor. There is no objection to assisted immigration when a husband sends for a wife, a brother for a sister, or a son for a parent. There is little danger that immigrants assisted to come in this way will become burdens upon the community. But the more distant the relationship, the less claim the new arrival has upon the person already here, and the less desirable on the whole is the assisted alien. Congress some years ago very properly recognized the danger in assisted immigration when it debarred from landing "any person whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another, or who is assisted by others to come." But, in order to make it possible for the members of a family to send for one another, the following words were added: "But this section shall not be held to prevent persons living in the United States from sending for a relative or friend who is not of the . . . excluded classes." The motive of Congress was excellent, but the phrasing of the law is too loose to meet present conditions. At present, about fifty per cent. of our total immigration is assisted, and, for an assisted immigrant, any one is a "friend," and any one up to a fifth or sixth cousin several times removed is a "relative." The time has come, with our present enormous immigration, to restrict to the immediate family the privilege of assisting other aliens. As a rule, it is safe to say that the less desirable immigrants are those who cannot pay their own passage. The clause in Section 2 of the Dillingham Bill is extremely liberal in making many exceptions in favor of members of a family. It is certain that this amendment would do much to diminish the number of those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who become public charges. It has heartily commended itself to our charitable societies all over the country.

The Law of March 3rd, 1903, provides:

"It shall be unlawful for any person, including any transportation company other than railway lines entering the United States from foreign contiguous territory, or the owner, master, agent, or consignee of any vessel, to bring to the United States any aliens afflicted with a loathsome or with a dangerous contagious disease."

For so doing, a fine of $100 is imposed for each alien so brought. All being agreed as to the necessity of excluding aliens suffering with loathsome and dangerous contagious diseases, we must also agree that the law of March 3rd, 1903, is right in fining a steamship company $100 for bringing over an alien afflicted with such a disease when "the existence of such disease might have been detected by means of a competent medical examination" at the time of embarkation. To make the steamship companies exercise suitable care in such matters is fair, not only to the diseased alien himself, who would otherwise have to be sent back, but also to the other passengers on the ship, who would be exposed to the risk of contracting the disease during the voyage. One of the distressing results of our present system is the large number of aliens who are denied admission after they have made the journey across the ocean. Commissioner-General Sargent has well said: "It is right that they should be denied admission; wrong that they ever should have started from home." The Immigration Conference at New York recommended that a fine of $100 be imposed on the steamship companies for each immigrant whom our inspectors reject *for any cause* under existing law.

The Senate Bill imposes a $100 fine in the cases of idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, insane persons and epileptics, provided their condition might have been ascertained by a competent medical examination at the ports of embarkation. The fine for aliens with loathsome and dangerous contagious diseases remains as at present.

As general medical inspection by American officials at foreign ports is not feasible, owing to the objection of certain foreign Governments, the only thing for us to do is obviously to force the steamship companies to make an examination themselves, and to fine them for bringing aliens whom we exclude, in all cases in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which an examination on embarkation may reasonably be expected to bring to light a cause of exclusion which we have named in our law.

Section 20 extends the time within which those becoming public charges may be deported to three years (it is now two years), a change which has received strong support from our boards of organized charities all over the country.

Section 26 gives authority to the Commissioner-General of Immigration to establish a division of information, whose duty shall be "to promote a beneficial distribution of aliens admitted into the United States among the several States and Territories desiring immigration." These "intelligence offices" may be established at any of the immigrant stations of the United States. Agents of the several States or Territories can present, to admitted aliens, the special inducements offered by their States or Territories to aliens, and displays of the resources and products of the different sections of the country may also be made at the same time. An appropriation of $20,000 is made for carrying out the provisions of this section.

This section is the result of a very general agitation for a more wide-spread distribution of the arriving aliens, and is the first official step in a movement which deserves support and encouragement. The demand for a better distribution of our immigrants from the congested city slums of the North and East has, however, been pushed far beyond the bounds of common sense. It is claimed by many persons that distribution is the real solution of the whole immigration problem, and that distribution, not further regulation, is what we should endeavor to bring about. It cannot be too often pointed out, in answer to this argument, that, as President Roosevelt well said in his last message, distribution is a palliative, not a cure. It can never solve the immigration problem.

To attempt to relieve our city slums by dispersing their inhabitants, without at the same time further restricting the number of newer aliens who will pour in, is very much like trying to keep a boat bailed out without stopping the leak. A recent writer has well said that distribution from our city slums is an aggravation of the immigration problem, "in that it tends to diminish the crowding in the slums in which our least desirable immigrants congregate, and thereby tends to make

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of those slums a sort of suction-pump by which the worst class of immigration is drawn to this country, given a course in the slums of our great cities, and then sent out to spread the slum in other parts of the country."

A canvass of the different States, made within a few months, brought forth from the officials to whom the inquiries were sent a vigorous protest against the wholesale shipment of aliens from the city slums into their States. Several of the Southern States have emphatically stated what nationalities of immigrants they want, and their preferences are for people from the northern United States and for northern Europeans. A leading newspaper of the South has said that no such immigrants as have crowded the East Side of New York and the factories of New England are wanted in the South.

Congressman A. P. Gardner, of Massachusetts, was right when he said, regarding enforced distribution to remedy the shortage of labor-supply in some sections:

"Population in the United States has always distributed itself, and will continue to do so, wherever it is best paid and wherever employment is steadiest."

In other words, distribution is governed by natural laws. A recent effort on the part of an Immigrant Protective Society in New York to send out through the South large numbers of aliens from the slums of New York met with the following rebuke at the hands of the "Manufacturers' Record" of Baltimore, one of the leading trade journals of the South:

"The circular of the Society seems to be upon a basis of 'organized philanthropy.' We have come to view with extreme caution 'organized philanthropic' efforts in behalf of the South, originating in New York or elsewhere, however businesslike their aspect. For such efforts, no matter how kindly disposed and well-conceived they may be, or how lofty and altruistic their purpose, might in the very nature of things not result to the South's advantage."

Section 29 excludes:

"All persons over sixteen years of age and physically capable of reading, who cannot read the English language or some other language; but an admissible immigrant or a person now in or hereafter admitted to this country may bring in or send for his wife, his children under eighteen years of age, and his parents or grandparents over fifty years of age, if they are otherwise admissible, whether they are so able to read or not."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No plan for further selecting immigration has had more general support than the illiteracy test. Commissioner-General Sargent has said:

"This requirement, whatever arguments or illustrations may be used to establish the contrary position, will furnish alien residents of a character less likely to become burdens on public or private charity. Otherwise, it must follow that rudimentary education is a handicap in the struggle for existence."

And Dr. Albert Shaw has put the case clearly when he says:

"While ability to read and write one's own language is by no means conclusive as to the desirability of a particular immigrant, it may certainly be regarded as a mark of superiority when taken in the average."

It is objected that such a test would not keep out anarchists and criminals, but as President Roosevelt has pointed out, it would "tend to decrease the sum of ignorance, so potent in producing the envy, suspicion, malignant passion, and hatred of order, out of which anarchistic sentiment inevitably springs." Moreover, this test is not to replace existing grounds for exclusion; it is an addition to them. A criminal, an anarchist, a polygamist, would be debarred under the present law, even if he could pass the illiteracy test. No one has ever claimed that the ability to read is a test of moral character, but such a test would certainly lessen the burden upon our schools and upon our charitable institutions. Every nation should care for its own illiterates, as it should care for its own insane and its own paupers. It is time for us to stop shouldering the burden of European and Asiatic illiteracy. Nothing that the United States can do for universal common-school education would be so effective as the adoption of an illiteracy test for immigrants. Thus a recent writer who is well informed regarding the condition of Italian immigration says:

"An educational test for immigrants might be an effective means of applying a stimulus to popular education in Italy, and might really assist the Government materially in its efforts to get children to the common schools."

And our consul at Venice has reported that, when it seemed probable a few years ago that illiterates would be debarred from the United States, night schools were opened in Italy for the benefit of intending immigrants, but when the prospect of such legislation vanished, the schools were closed. The United States Industrial Commission said:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"If compulsory education is desirable as a preparation for American citizenship and as a protection to the citizens themselves, it is equally desirable for immigrants who are prospective citizens and for American children who are prospective citizens."

Our immigration laws should have for a leading object the protection of American citizenship. It is absurdly inconsistent for us to spend vast sums of money in the education of American children, and then open our gates freely to thousands of aliens who have not been required to obtain similar education.

There is no danger that the exclusion of illiterates would cause a scarcity of labor in this country. If there is a demand for laborers, the supply will be forthcoming from Europe. If the steamship companies cannot bring illiterates, they will fill their steerages with aliens who can read. And with the stimulus thus put upon education, the illiteracy in many of the countries of Europe would soon show a notable decline. There is plenty of labor now in our cities which would be better off in the country, where there is great need of farm "help." But the cities attract, and the farmer waits for his help. So it would be under the illiteracy test.

The illiteracy test has passed the House four times and the Senate three times in recent years. It has been recommended by Presidents McKinley and Roosevelt and by the Commissioner-General of Immigration, and thousands of petitions in its favor have been sent to Congress.

The Dillingham Bill, as passed by the Senate, embodies a series of amendments to existing immigration laws which have received the endorsement of the most competent, the most unprejudiced and the most trustworthy authorities on immigration in the country. Immigration officials; medical inspectors of the Immigration Service; boards of charity and of insanity; labor organizations; boards of trade; State legislatures; immigration conferences; and thousands of societies and organizations of various kinds have endorsed some or all of its provisions, and previous Congresses also have passed some of the most important amendments which it contains.

Congressman Gardner, of Massachusetts, on behalf of the House Immigration Committee, reported a bill (H. R. 17,941) on April 9th, 1906, prepared after a careful study of a large number of immigration bills introduced into the House during

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Session. After the Dillingham Bill had passed the Senate, and had been referred to the House Committee, the latter reported, as an amendment to S. 4,403, House bill 18,673, which was H. R. 17,941 with a few changes. The Gardner Bill, as it is generally called, raised the duty on alien passengers from $2 to $5; excluded (*a*) imbeciles and feeble-minded persons; (*b*) persons of such poor physique as to incapacitate them for work, if dependent for their support upon their own physical exertions; (*c*) assisted immigrants whose passage was paid by any corporation, association, society, municipality or foreign government; (*d*) unaccompanied children under sixteen; and (*e*) illiterates, and extended the period of deportation for public charges to three years. The bill also made provision for the establishment of a bureau of information at each immigrant station. The Gardner Bill is weaker than the Senate Bill in the provision for excluding persons of poor physique, which reads as follows in the former:

> **"Persons who are dependent for their support upon their own physical exertions, and who are certified by the examining medical officer to be of a low vitality or poor physique such as would incapacitate them for such work."**

By the wording, "who are dependent for their support upon their own physical exertions," the whole clause is made of little or no value. The large majority of aliens certified as physically unfit would find friends or relatives who would promise the immigration officers to help these physically defective immigrants to some extent, so that the latter would not be wholly "dependent for their support upon their own physical exertions." In other words, there would then be the same difficulty as exists at present in the case of aliens deemed liable to become public charges. Friends and relatives, the latter often very distant, assure the officials that these aliens will be taken care of, and will not become a public charge; the aliens are admitted—and the friends and relatives forget their promises. The only way to secure the exclusion of this most undesirable class of physically unfit, defective and degenerate aliens is to give the medical officer the whole authority in the matter, just as is now rightly done in the case of an alien suffering with a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease, or who is insane, or an idiot.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The House bill omits one important addition to the excluded classes which is made by the Senate bill, viz., assisted immigrants outside of the immediate members of a family. The bill also makes some changes in the administrative features of existing laws.

The House did not reach the consideration of the immigration bill until June 25th, in the last week of the Session. During these last few hours, as is well known, in the haste and confusion just before adjournment, when many members have already left Washington, it frequently happens that bills are amended, and then passed, without any adequate discussion or understanding of the changes which are actually being made. This was true of the immigration bill on June 25th last. By unprecedented tactics on the part of the Speaker and of a few of his lieutenants, and without question against the sober judgment of the majority of the House of Representatives, the immigration bill as passed after very hurried consideration was shorn of (1) the increased head-money and of (2) the illiteracy test. Two additions were made to the bill. One amendment provides for a commission consisting of two Senators, three members of the House, and two private citizens, to make "full inquiry, examination and investigation of the subject of immigration." There can obviously be no harm in the appointment of such a commission, nor, on the other hand, will anything be gained by such an inquiry, in view of the very considerable knowledge of the whole subject which all persons who choose to study immigration may obtain from publications which are already available. Another amendment, offered by Mr. Littauer, of New York, was as follows:

"That an immigrant who proves that he is seeking admission to this country solely to avoid prosecution or punishment on religious or political grounds, for an offence of a political character, or prosecution involving danger of imprisonment or danger to life and limb on account of religious belief, shall not be deported because of want of means or the probability of his being unable to earn a livelihood."

The intention of this clause is obvious and praiseworthy, but if enacted into law it would effectively break down the existing barriers against undesirable aliens which Congress has wisely set up. One of the most undesirable classes of aliens is clearly that of persons who are liable to become public charges. But to adopt the Littauer amendment would make it diffi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cult or even impossible to exclude any alien on the ground of liability to become a public charge. For a very large majority of our immigrants would attempt to show, in some way or other, that they had come here "to avoid prosecution or punishment on religious or political grounds." Political, religious and economic reasons are among the most potent factors in inducing immigration to this country, and impending punishment for religious or political causes would be urged by many aliens as the reason for their coming, without the possibility of contradiction by our immigration officials. This amendment would practically nullify one of the most important clauses in existing law, and one which has universally commended itself. It is no wonder that, as Congressman Gardner said in the House on June 25th, "the Immigration Bureau seriously objects" to this clause. It is no wonder that Gen. Grosvenor opposed the amendment, saying that he feared that "very grave complications will grow up under this hasty style of legislation."

The situation in the Conference Committee is, then, the following: The Senate, acting deliberately, after unlimited debate, passed an immigration bill, without division, which embodies the results of years of the most careful study on the part of recognized experts. Every one of its provisions has had strong endorsement at the hands of competent, unprejudiced, and thoroughly trustworthy officials, as well as of the public generally. The Dillingham Bill is an adequate, well-considered, rational measure, which amends existing laws to meet present and future conditions in a thoroughly sane and satisfactory way. The House, under extraordinary pressure, after a very limited debate, in confusion and haste, with conflicting votes, completely emasculated the bill of its own Committee. More than that, at the end of the debate, without any adequate thought or discussion, an amendment was adopted which would tremendously weaken the present laws. In other words, the House took a step backward along the line of breaking down legislation which has been well built up in past years.

ROBERT DEC. WARD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERY DISPUTE

BY P. T. MC GRATH.

No more vexatious international entanglement could well be imagined than the present fishery dispute between Newfoundland and the United States. While, superficially, it appears to be a mere question of whether the Colonial Government can hamper American fishermen in procuring cargoes of herring on the West Coast of the Island, it really comprehends the genesis of the dispute between the Republic and Canada respecting the whole Atlantic Fisheries, which has proved so difficult of solution during the past fifty years. A close study of the subject shows it to be fraught with serious problems and complicated offshoots, and to bristle with issues demanding the subtlest reasoning and most cautious presentments by jurists and statesmen.

The pending deadlock has its direct and serious bearing for Canada as well as for Newfoundland, because in the negotiations between Britain and America any basis of interpretation which may be reached respecting hitherto unsettled points as to the phraseology and bearing of the Treaty of 1818, must apply to those portions of Canada's seaboard where the American fishermen have treaty rights such as they possess on part of the Newfoundland coast; and, therefore, Canada will assuredly be called into conference, as well as Newfoundland, so as to make the conclusions final and absolute.

To a clear understanding of the merits of the present entanglement, a brief review of the history of this fishery dispute will be helpful. The American Colonists had common fishing rights in the waters of Canada and Newfoundland till the war of 1776. These were continued by the Treaty of 1783, but abrogated by the war of 1812. In 1818, the United States accepted rights on certain coasts, detailed below, and renounced them elsewhere.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From 1854 to 1866, the Reciprocity Treaty ruled, when the fish of either country had free entry into the other. From 1871 to 1886, the Washington Treaty allowed certain inshore fishing concessions to America in northern waters in return for a payment of $5,500,000. In 1887, a new fisheries treaty was negotiated, but rejected by the United States Senate. In 1888, a *modus vivendi* was concluded, giving American fishermen inshore privileges in the non-treaty waters of Canada and Newfoundland on paying a license fee of $1.50 per ship-ton. In 1890, Newfoundland and the United States framed the Bond-Blaine Convention for fisheries reciprocity, which Canada's protest to the British Government prevented being ratified. In 1895, and again in 1898, Canada sought reciprocity herself, but without effect. In 1902, she withdrew her objection to the Newfoundland Convention, and the Bond-Hay Treaty was arranged, which the United States Senate early in 1905 "amended to death," so that Newfoundland at once abrogated the *modus vivendi,* excluded the American fishermen from her non-treaty waters, and restricted them solely to their treaty rights in the areas where they possessed these.

The present difficulty between Newfoundland and the United States arises out of the Treaty of 1818. By that agreement the Republic obtained liberty for its inhabitants to take fish of every description forever in common with British subjects on the south coast of Newfoundland, from Ramea Islands westward to Cape Ray; on the west coast, from Cape Ray to Quirpon Islands; on the coast of Labrador, from Mount Joly, opposite Anticosti, eastward through Belle Isle Straits, thence northward indefinitely; and on the shores of the Magdalen Islands; with the supplementary right to land and dry their fish on the unsettled portions of Labrador and on the south coast of Newfoundland, but only while such seaboards continued unsettled. To all the rest of the British-American littoral the American fishermen were denied access, save for wood, water, shelter and repairs; and "for no other purpose whatever" might they enter.

It thus follows that, in the prosecution of their deep-sea fisheries, the Americans have no inshore waters wherein they may obtain bait or food-fishes, save those of the south and west coasts of Newfoundland and the Atlantic seaboard of Labrador, which is an appanage of Newfoundland; and in the Magdalen Islands

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the Laurentian frontal of Labrador, both of which belong to Canada. The right would appear to be amply clear, but there is nothing so uncertain as the meaning that may be given to treaty clauses. Thus, under the first reciprocity compact, lobsters were admitted duty free, but the cans containing them were levied upon; and it was proposed, later, to stop locomotives and cars at the American border, though the freight they bore had the right of free entry. These fishery disputes have been prolific of more friction between America, Britain, Canada and Newfoundland the past ninety years than any other disagreements.

The first issue which arises in respect to the Treaty of 1818 is what was meant by the word "coast" itself, for in the Peace Treaty of 1783 the people of the United States, while granted fishing rights on the Newfoundland coast, were forbidden to dry their catch on the "harbors, bays and creeks," so it was clear that some distinction was even then drawn between "coasts" and the bays and creeks, or indentations thereof. In the Treaty of 1818, this phraseology was repeated, and fishing rights were granted Americans on the "coast" of Newfoundland, on the "shores" of the Magdalen Islands, and on the "coasts, bays, harbors and creeks" of Labrador, while they were interdicted from three marine miles of any of the other "coasts, bays, harbors and creeks" of British North America, save to enter such "bays or harbors" when in distress. Before the Halifax Fisheries Commission, the Arbitration Tribunal which in 1877 fixed the sum to be paid by the United States for fishing concessions under the Washington Treaty of 1871, the question as to the distinction between "coasts" and the inlets thereof was exhaustively argued; but no attempt was ever made to give it practical effect until Premier Bond, in April, 1905, in introducing his retaliatory enactment against the American fishermen, because of the Senate's emasculation of the Bond-Hay Treaty, advanced the argument that the Americans, while entitled to fish along the west coast of Newfoundland, had no right to operate in the Bay of Islands or other inlets there. This bay is the principal seat of the winter herring fishery; and the effect of such a position, if upheld by the British Cabinet, the treaty-making and treaty-enforcing power, would be to deprive the New England fishermen of one of their most lucrative undertakings. The British Cabinet, however, declined to acquiesce in this construction

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meanwhile, and the American fishermen are exercising this liberty now till a complete settlement is arranged.

In the prosecution of this fishery, though, the Americans could be prevented from obtaining the local aid which they had enjoyed formerly, and this course the Colony decided on. They could take fish themselves, it is true, but they could not buy fish, hire men, nor purchase necessities—and this prohibition was rigidly enforced. Thereupon, the United States vessels proceeded outside the three-mile limit, after arranging with local fisherfolk to follow them there. These fisherfolk, being beyond the Colonial jurisdiction, hired on board these vessels and returned into Colonial waters to catch herring for them, as members of their crews. This proceeding raised two distinct issues—first, Were American vessels which operated under a register fishing-craft? and, second, Were men so hired "inhabitants of the United States," to whom alone were the Treaty rights conceded? Respecting the first of these points, it is well to note that American fishing-vessels generally operate under a "fishing enrolment," whereas "merchantmen" carry a register. Many of the vessels engaged in the herring fishery use the latter certificate, and therefore are regarded as traders, not fishermen; and the right of traders to engage in fishing, the Newfoundland authorities questioned. The vessels affected appealed to Washington, and the State Department declared that a register embraced a "fishing enrolment" within it, and that such vessels could not be denied the right to fish.

Yet it is a curious fact that, in a despatch from Secretary Bayard to Ambassador Sackville-West on October 27th, 1886, the former asks "authoritative information of the Canadian laws regulating the sale and exportation of fresh herring from Grand Manan . . . a trade which has been carried on almost exclusively in American vessels for many years . . . for, although the vessels employed in this trade are duly registered in their home ports as fishing-vessels, yet, so far as the proposed trade is concerned, they are not manned or equipped nor in any manner prepared for taking fish, but their use is confined to the conveyance of fish as merchandise to ports in the United States, a commercial transaction *pur et simple*"; and the owners of these vessels wished to know if they could continue this trade after the abrogation of the Washington Treaty. Canada's reply was unfavorable, and as the above was virtually the status of the Amer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ican vessels frequenting Newfoundlond waters until last year, they *buying* and not taking the fish, Newfoundland claimed authority to treat them similarly.

Secretary Root to-day maintains that such vessels must be regarded as legitimate fishing-craft, and Newfoundland admits the claim pending a final adjustment of the whole subject; but the course taken by Mr. Root has precipitated an entirely unexpected result in Maritime Canada, where these vessels frequently resort to hire men and procure supplies on their way to and from Newfoundland, which they could do without charge as "traders," but which as "fishers" renders them liable to the license fee of about $150 per craft, under the terms of the *modus vivendi,* by which alone American fishing-craft can obtain access to Canadian non-treaty waters. This is an unpalatable decision for the owners of these craft, but there is no alternative for them, save to risk being prevented from operating in Newfoundland waters.

Against the hiring of its people outside the three-mile limit in the manner practised, the Newfoundland Government has protested, as being against the letter and spirit of the Treaty of 1818, which cedes these fishing liberties to "inhabitants of the United States," whereas the effect of this invasion is that five-sixths of each crew are Newfoundlanders. This protest was based on the notable stand made by Ambassador Phelps during another phase of this fishery dispute in 1886, when, in his despatch to Lord Iddesleigh on the subject of the seizure of American vessels by Canadian cruisers, he declared:

> "If the British Courts should, nevertheless, find such authority in any existing Statute, the question, whether the Statute itself, or the construction given it, is warranted by the Treaty, would still remain; and also the still higher question whether, *if the strict technical reading of the Treaty might be thought to warrant such a result, it is one which ought to be enforced between sovereign and friendly nations, acting in the spirit of the Treaty.*"

Contending, then, that an interpretation of the Treaty which would prevent American shipmasters from enticing her men outside the territorial waters in small boats, at great risk to their lives, to "sign on" to these craft as part of their crews, would be but following the lines of Ambassador Phelps's despatch, Newfoundland has laid her case before the Mother Country.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The United States Cabinet having secured recognition for all classes of shipping, and the right for such to fish even in the harbors, bays and creeks, Newfoundland still claimed authority to board and overhaul them, and compel them to enter at the custom-houses, pay light dues and obey local revenue laws, and thus prevent smuggling and other lawlessness, or the invasion of the waters by vessels of other nationalities masquerading as Americans. This claim was likewise resisted by Secretary Root, who is represented by the Gloucester shipowners as having supplied them with the following memorandum to be forwarded to their vessels in those waters, as defining their rights therein:

"Vessels of American registry have the right to fish at any point, bay, harbor or inlet of the Treaty Coast of Newfoundland, with or without entering at Newfoundland custom-houses, for any kind of fish in any manner they think best, provided owner and master and mate are Americans, irrespective of nationality of crews or locality where crews are shipped, except Newfoundland crews shipped in Newfoundland territorial waters within the three-mile limit. If Newfoundland has any local law, which I do not think is the case, forbidding her citizens to ship in foreign ports or upon the high seas for the purpose of fishing in her own waters your rights may not be so clear, so far as Newfoundlanders are concerned."

In answer to this epitome of alleged American rights, Newfoundland has forwarded to the British Government a long and important communication, dealing with these several aspects of the question, and setting out, particularly, the manner in which Canada has been enforcing her interpretation of the Treaty on the Magdalen Islands and Laurentian Labrador, for over half a century, virtually on the lines which Newfoundland now contends for. The force of this answer lies in the fact that never before has there been any disagreement between the Newfoundland and United States Governments in regard to the Treaty, because Newfoundland has always been friendly with the New England fishermen heretofore, whereas Canada has invariably enforced the Convention in the most drastic and unfriendly fashion, and yet the Imperial Cabinet has nearly always upheld the Canadians in their views of that instrument.

All of these points, however, have been reserved for the two Cabinets to negotiate over, with a view to a satisfactory and final settlement, if possible. The matter of the liability of the American fishermen to the local fishery regulations is not new, for it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

figured prominently in a famous fishery problem, the Fortune Bay Dispute. That was an outgrowth of the Washington Treaty of 1871, by which American fishermen acquired the right of free access and common usage of all the other Canadian and Newfoundland seaboards for twelve years, and under cover of which certain American vessels entered Fortune Bay, and on Sunday, January 6th, proceeded to take herring with purse-seines, in violation of three local ordinances prohibiting (1) all fishing on Sunday; (2) the "barring" or enclosing of fish in such seines; and (3) the seining of herring in the close season, between October and April. The coast folk forcibly intervened to prevent such violation of their laws, and compelled the Americans to desist, destroying one seine. The vessels affected put in bills for $105,000 damages; and, after three years of diplomatic correspondence, England paid $75,000 in full settlement, with the result that, as millions of dollars of the "Alabama" award are said to be still in the United States Treasury, nearly $20,000 of this amount remained unpaid after all claims had been proved.

England, however, in paying this amount, was careful to emphasize that she did so to satisfy the demands for redress for mob law; and she never receded from the position that she (or her colonies) possessed the sole right to prescribe the methods of administering and preserving these fisheries. This contention was supported by a circular issued by Secretary Marcy, at Washington, in 1856, in which he declared that:

"It is understood that there are certain Acts of the British North American Colonial Legislatures, and also perhaps executive regulations, intended to prevent the wanton destruction of the fishes which frequent the coasts of the colonies, and injuries to the fisheries thereon. It is deemed reasonable that both the British fishermen and the United States should pay a like respect to such laws and regulations, which are designed to preserve and increase the productiveness of the fisheries on those coasts. Such being the object of these laws and regulations, the observance of them is enforced upon the citizens of the United States in the like manner as they are observed by British subjects."

With respect to the Colonial claim of authority to search American fishing-vessels and compel them to report at the custom-houses, the demand for light dues is not an assertion of sovereignty, but an insistence that American fishermen using these Newfoundland ports should contribute to the coast aids provided, a position which every maritime country exacts for her-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self, and agrees to in her neighbors. The acquiescence of the American fishermen in these local laws is also a claim which Newfoundland considers herself justified in, because from the manner in which these American fishing-vessels now interpret Secretary Root's message, murder might be done on board them and they defy the Colonial officers to arrest the offenders. This is not an extreme position to take. Two years ago the master of a New England fishing-vessel shot and killed one of his crew in a Newfoundland port, and the right of the Colonial authorities to try the case was questioned in certain quarters.

It must be obvious, then, that the quoted declaration of Secretary Root, which is amplified in a despatch forwarded to Lord Lansdowne, in October, 1905, is one to which grave objection may reasonably be taken by the other party to the case, and contains propositions which, in the form laid down by him, the British Government cannot assent to, save by the sacrifice of all the principles which it has upheld in respect of this question for the past fifty years. It is true that most of the friction which arose came from evasions or breaches of the subsequent accords, and not of the original treaty, because, except for the advantage of exploiting the West Coast herring fishery, the Treaty shore of Newfoundland is now almost valueless to the Americans, being too remote from the Grand Banks to make a feasible baiting region, and too depleted by the local trawlers to serve as a satisfactory fishing-ground. But there exist sufficient precedents, in one form or another, to cover every phase of the problem which has become acute now, and to warrant Britain, Canada and Newfoundland in maintaining the views which they have placed on record in the past.

Another point which has long clamored for adjustment, and which this controversy has revived, is that respecting the extent of territorial jurisdiction seaward. In the recent trouble at Bay of Islands, the United States Fish Commission's schooner "Grampus," with an expert from that Department on board, Mr. Alexander, was stationed at the scene to watch the interests of American fishermen. The "Grampus," on each occasion when a United States "herringer" intended to go outside to ship men, preceded her and took up a position sufficiently far out to be beyond Colonial waters, and the fishing-vessel, sailing slightly farther out, received the men on board and so avoided any dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pute in which the United States Government would not support her. In all the fishing problems affecting Canada and Newfoundland, however, the three-mile limit has been a most irritating one. The same problem has affected all maritime boundary disputes, notably that respecting Alaska, recently settled. Generally speaking, the United States maintains that the three-mile limit should follow the sinuosities of the coast, whereas Great Britain contends for the "headland" theory, claiming all bays to be local waters and jurisdiction to extend three miles beyond an imaginary line drawn from the outer promontories. These antagonistic attitudes have been compromised in draft treaties arranged in 1866 and 1886, but never ratified by the United States Senate, though based upon the modern practice of European nations, that bays less than ten miles in width are regarded as territorial waters, while in larger bays jurisdiction is held to extend to the point where they are ten miles wide, the three-mile strip along the shore outward from there being also recognized. This problem is not so pertinent to the herring fishery on the west coast, where the bays are narrow and islands crop up so as to enable the three-mile limit to be strictly followed, but it applies more particularly to the larger bays, such as Fortune, Placentia, Conception, Trinity and Bonavista on the south and east coasts. In territorial waters to which the American fishermen have no right of entry under the Treaty of 1818, they were allowed access to purchase bait and supplies under the *modus vivendi* of 1888; but, in the spring of 1905, the Newfoundland Legislature cancelled this makeshift so far as her seaboard is concerned, though Canada still retains it in force. This policy Newfoundland's action is likely to induce her to terminate in the near future, as it is now apparent to the statesmen of both countries that there is no hope of obtaining reciprocity from the United States, and that they may really do better if they show a united front against American fishery aggression.

One of the American fisherman's grievances which Secretary Root lays the strongest stress upon is that the Newfoundland "Foreign Fishing Vessels Act," the statute directed especially against United States vessels, gives authority to Colonial officers to seize and bring into port, even on the Treaty Coast, any craft of the nationality and character of which they may be doubtful, and Mr. Root protests against it, emphasizing the fact that it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may lay American fishing-vessels open to serious interference in the conduct of their legitimate operations there. But the Colonial authorities, in their answer, point out that similar legislation has been enacted and ratified by the Imperial Government for enforcing this treaty since 1819, and by Canada in various measures since 1866, while it is also contended that such a regulation is necessary, in order to preserve order and regulate the fishing, treaty or no treaty.

Thirty years ago, after the Fortune Bay affair, Secretary Evarts expressed himself as of the opinion that "if there are to be regulations of a common enjoyment, they must be authenticated by a common or joint authority," and "such competent authority can only be found in a joint convention, that shall receive the approval of Her Majesty's Government and of our own." Lord Salisbury, on the other hand, contended for the absolute right of Great Britain, through her colonies, to impose upon foreign fishermen all restrictions which she in good faith imposed upon her own subjects. Secretary Blaine, when he took office, proposed to send American war-ships to Newfoundland to protect the fishery rights of his countrymen, and then advocated a joint naval fishery patrol, but nothing was done and the friction gradually ceased. In the present instance, it is not known with any degree of accuracy what the United States is contending for, or what the British Cabinet is upholding; but it is to be hoped that a compromise may be reached which will dispose of this difficulty in a way satisfactory to both sides, and thus avoid any rift in the present amicable relations between the British Empire and the American Republic.*

P. T. McGrath.

* On October 5th, 1906, a *modus vivendi* was concluded between the British and American Governments to regulate the herring fishery for the season from October 15th, 1906, to January 15th, 1907, whereby, to admit of further negotiations for a permanent treaty, the American fishermen were allowed to use purse-seines in Colonial waters and to ship Colonial fishermen outside the three-mile limit, but were required to abstain from fishing on Sundays and obliged to pay light dues and to report at the custom-houses when ice would not prevent, all Newfoundland's laws which might abridge these liberties being held inoperative by the British Ministry. The arrangement evoked a storm of protest from the Colony, and drastic measures were threatened at the opening of the Colonial Legislature in January, 1907.—P. T. McG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CASE OF ESPERANTO.

BY GEORGE MACLOSKIE, PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF BIOLOGY IN PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

It is very evident that both in America and in the Old World, Esperanto is now in the air; and one is overwhelmed with the literature which is coming forward, some of it in Esperanto, and other about Esperanto. The Paris "*Figaro*" had an earnest plea in its favor, from M. René de Saussure, descendant of him of Alpine fame; and a very warm counterplea from M. le Comte d'Haussonville, a member of the great Academy of Sciences. This nobleman has a dread of the new language, as likely to displace his own beloved French from its present supremacy as "the international language of the world." In the same spirit some of ourselves are so fond and so hopeful of English as destined to become the world's language, that we are cold to any competitor. But Esperanto is not a competitor with any national language. If an earthquake were to exterminate all the non-English-speaking humanities, we should quickly relegate Esperanto to the shelf as a memento. Now its mission is exclusively "internacial" (a new word, which Haussonville accepts in French from the Esperantists). The distress and rage of the French nobleman is that professors of the French universities, and even Academicians, including M. le recteur Boirac, have gone over to the enemy; and he would like, the Frenchman here adopting an inelegant Americanism, to wield the "big stick" against them.

On the other hand this arch offender, M. le recteur Boirac, gives us in Esperanto a long account of the visit of the French University men to England and the English universities, and their reception by a representative of the British Government and by King Edward; he also narrates sundry Esperantist inci-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dents of the trip. I wish it were possible to give a translation of this historical narrative, as it is the best possible reply to the charge that Esperanto is not fit to be a vehicle for history or literature. But the reference must be only to one Esperanto incident. When, on behalf of the Government, Mr. Lough, Under Secretary for Education, was addressing the visitors in English, as he spoke rapidly Boirac lost the thread of the speech, and became drowsy. Whereupon he was startled by hearing the word "Esperanto," and next by observing that his colleagues were looking at himself and laughing. Being disconcerted by this, and supposing that the Englisher had been poking fun at his dear fad, he was afterwards relieved to learn that Mr. Lough had highly praised Esperanto, and had urged the extension of its study as destined to aid international comity. He remarked that as between England and France they could manage to get along without it, but in the international congresses which are approaching, and which will include many representatives of distant nations, it will be a great help.

The name of Wilhelm Ostwald ranks high among the world's scholars, as foremost or nearly foremost of Germany's physicists. He has also been a student of the internacial-language question; and in his address last September at the great celebration in Aberdeen University, Scotland, he gave Esperanto a fillip. Remarking that the idea of international peace has no greater promoter than the scientist, he expressed his regret that one great hindrance has been diversity of language; and he added: "I express my strong conviction that this problem is on the way of being solved by means of an international auxiliary language." And in the same spirit the aged Ernst Naville writes that for thirty years he has regarded this as a necessary complement of advancing civilization. "If we can one day say that beside national languages which shall continue their national development, there is a means of communication among all the inhabitants of the earth, a language of humanity, that day will be one of the great dates of history." This is what Esperanto aspires to become, and what those who know it best think it is well fitted to become.

The academic thesis that a world-wide language is an impossibility runs neck and neck with that of the British physicist who contended that an ocean-crossing steamship was impossible.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But now transatlantic steamers are running, and a language is launched and entering business life, which though not aspiring to be universal, is proving itself to be universally international, and we need not further discuss the thesis.

A recent article by Professor Hugo Münsterberg attacks and condemns Esperanto for the sins of the dead Volapük. Its arguments give no indication that the writer knows anything about either of the languages; and all his arguments, except the opening discussion of the spelling reform, appear to be simply a popularization of the arguments of Professor Richard Hamel, in a German work which was published when Dr. Münsterberg was a junior professor in Freiburg.

In the title of Hamel's book, and through the discussion, general condemnations of a universal language appear; but these contemplated only Volapük and its predecessors. When you reach the last section of Hamel's book you come to the word "Esperanto" and find a fair presentation of its merits, furnished by Professor Einstein, a convert from Volapük to Esperanto. Hamel quotes without note or comment Einstein's condemnation of Schleyer, the inventor and dictator of Volapük, whom Einstein calls a "Volapükist Pope"; and Einstein exults at the escape of the new language from any tyranny by "Dr. Esperanto." He says of it: "From the ashes of Volapük came Esperanto, whose words are good old words, known as from Romanish and German origin; and in spite of its regularity its structure is so very Italianesque that one easily fancies it is derived thence."

In all this Hamel is scholarly and fair. It remains for my distinguished Harvard friend to explain why, without explanation, and apparently without examination, he has extended Hamel's charge into a sweeping condemnation of that which Hamel permitted to be praised. In common with most of our American college men, I am an admirer of Dr. Münsterberg, because of his *bonhomie* and his undoubted ability. And in the present instance I wish him success in explaining the situation.

It seems to me very probable that somebody has been frightened by Hamel's illustrations from the "Portuguese Volapüks" of the sixteenth century, and by the telegraph codes with 70,000 words of the nineteenth century. I think that Hamel was sound in this objection as against the Volapük, but that a man misses the mark when he fires it against Esperanto. Zamenhof also was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oppressed by the thought of people being required to memorize a code, and he set himself to provide a remedy. With what result? Here is the evidence beside me, a small book of 27 pages, costing less than two cents, and entitled "The Whole of Esperanto." It consists of a grammar, over which you may leisurely spend an hour. You will then find yourself in the same situation relatively to the *lingvo* that you would occupy relatively to Greek, after you had mastered the declensions and conjugations, in their different voices, the verbs in *mi,* and all the irregular verbs, with the dialectical peculiarities. But still the Esperanto Vocabulary must be faced. Well, here it is, occupying 16 pages of the little book, and containing a fairly complete word-root Vocabulary of two thousand items. From each of these roots you can make the words as easily as you get "loving" after you have found "love" in your dictionary. Each word-root is good for a colony of words. Thus Zamenhof gives from *san* (health) 53 with "&c." to remind us that the well is not yet emptied; and O'Connor gives for the root *lern* (learn), 36 words, beginning *lerni* (to learn), *lernadi* (to study), *lernegi* (to cram), and so on; only a partial list. Under this system there can be little terror in the presence even of 70,000 words.

I have tried to estimate how many of the roots would be new to an English boy who had no Latin, and the result was one-third nearly, or about 600; to one who had Latin and English, about half as many; to one of our college teachers I should say about 100; to be mastered not in advance, but as they occur in detail. So there need be no alarm.

The uninitiated reader may well ask how is it possible to do all that is claimed by Esperantists. The only reply must be that it was a work of genius, though, now that it is done, it seems very simple and obvious. Perhaps the best way of explaining it is to give a sketch of another competitor for internacial honors, the Neutra. This youngster is a wonder. Two pages of it were sent to me, and though printed in Russia by people who probably knew no English, I translated the whole thing at sight, without the help of grammar or dictionary. It gave me as much trouble, apparently, as I should have had if it had been in phonetically printed English. I think it is a system that may be utilized in the code-telegraph method, so as to avoid translating. It was constructed by old Volapükists as a counterblast to Esperanto;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and its method was to pick out the common sporadic words of the modern European languages, as far as common words go, and then to fill the gaps from Latin as an over-tongue. The same method may be extended to the languages of other continents; to the Indian languages, with Sanskrit as the over-tongue; and the Chinese languages, with the Mandarin as over-tongue; and to a good many languages of Western Asia and North Africa, with Arabic as over-tongue. The other side of the work, writing Neutra, would still involve the difficulties of Volapük, and must be faced by means of having the telegraph-offices supplied with men who were specially trained for a very difficult work. The language also has been not merely simplified but denuded of its grammar, and internationally made as different as possible from Esperanto. This has been a mistake, which may prejudice its utility in practice. As an international language it is hopeless, as it only postpones, and thereby intensifies, the troubles of Volapük.

The first problem which Zamenhof attacked and solved in his great work was the grammar. If I take from the Lord's Prayer a single sentence the method can be easily seen: "*Kaj ne konduku nin en tenton, sed savu nin de la malbono.*" Here are some small words, which, after the style in Greek grammar, I am tempted to call "particles"; such as adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions; they are inevitable but not very numerous. One of them is the first word *kaj* (with the Continental pronunciation of *j* as if it were *y*). This is the Greek particle, signifying "and." Another is *ne,* the Latin negative, which with various modifications runs through the European languages; again, *en,* "in" or "into" is a preposition, French-Spanish, and corresponding to the Latin-Italian-English "in." *Sed,* "but," is pure Latin; *de,* "of," is also somewhat of a European tramp, in the Latin countries, though foreign to German-English.

The remaining monosyllables are apt to be either pronouns, or *la,* "the," which is French-Italian. One of these pronouns is *nin,* the final letter, *n,* always marking the accusative case, and the other part *ni,* "we," being our old acquaintance in Greek, Latin, Italian, French, etc. Now, coming to the many-syllables we have one of them, *malbono,* ending in *o,* which is always the diacritic mark of a noun in the nominative singular; another, *tenton,* ending in *on,* which is the accusative singular of a noun,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and two ending in *u*, which is always the imperative-subjunctive of a verb. The first of these, *konduku*, or "lead," "conduct" in the English; either "do thou conduct," "do ye conduct," or "let us conduct," according to the context. Professor Münsterberg quarrels with this because it does not, like Greek or Latin, give a different form for each number and person; but neither does the English nor his own German in this case; yet we get along well enough without it. In cases, as the present of *am*, and of other verbs, where the distinction is retained, it becomes a snare to children, who mix "am" and "is" and "are"; and even to pulpitmen who sometimes shock our grammatical feelings by starting quarrels between verbs and their nominatives. So we offer thanks to Dr. Zamenhof for having moved away a stumbling-block.

We have said that *tenton* is the accusative singular of a noun. It is our English word, *tempt*, in the reformed spelling of Esperanto; or perhaps it has flowed pure from the Latin-Italian *tentare*. Having neither suffix nor prefix, it is a type of the fundamental Esperanto words. We may even try it as a specimen of word development. *Tento* is the noun, temptation; *tenta*, the adjective, tempting; *tenti* is the verb, to tempt; and its present participle, recalling our Latin acquaintance, *tentans* with its genitive *tentantis*, is *tentanta*, tempting, or with a noun ending *tentanto*, a tempter; the adverb would be *tente*, or a participial adverb *tentante*, temptingly. Then we might try the prefixes, *ektenti*, to begin tempting; *maltenti*, to do the opposite of tempting, whatever that may be; and again the suffixes, *tentego*, would be a great temptation; *tenteto*, a small, petty, temptation; *tentaro* would signify temptations taken collectively, and *tentero*, one of the temptations taken separately. If *tento*, or *tentego*, or *tentanto*, be personified, as a male demon, then his female counterpart is, *tentino*, *tentegino*, or *tentantino*.

Thus when any one root-word occurs in a vocabulary, it stands for a host of its friends and foes. *Malbono*, the evil, is an instance of the value of the prefix *mal*, which turns good (bono) into its antithesis. *Savu* is the imperative of the word coming from the root of our English word save, and needs no comment further than to note that its participial noun *Savanto* is the great word for Saviour. He is the *Savanto de la mondo*, the "Saviour of the World," just as Esperanto, the "Hoper," was the pet

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

name of Zamenhof, and has stuck to his language, as perpetuating its Christian optimism.

The two words *tenton* and *malbono* give us one of the refinements of the Esperanto grammar. The rule is that every preposition governs the nominative case in this language. But whilst *tenton* is accusative, *malbono* is nominative according to the rule. There is, however, another rule, that the goal at which we arrive, either in space or time, must go into the accusative; and as *en* here signifies temptation as the goal, and is to be translated not *in* but *into,* we use the accusative. Refinements of this kind amuse Esperantists, who are desirous to perfect their "kara lingvo," and who are very much afraid that some of us may spoil it by our inexperience. But the language itself is delightfully easy, and positively fascinating.

The objection that people from remote places could not understand each other, even if they should master a common language, was plausible when presented by Hamel. He spoke of failures of the sixteenth century in China, Malaya, Tamul and India; and he might have referred to later times, with *pigeon-English.* That sort of English is very useful along the Chinese seaboard, but, after all, is very imperfect as a vehicle for literature. If I with my Scotch-Irish English tried to regulate a sampan-man with his pigeon variety, I fear I should be worsted. Now, in Princeton, however, where for a third of a century I have been conscientiously endeavoring to exuviate the Scotch-Irish, all my efforts have failed. Yet I have discovered that, thanks to the internationalism of these boys, I have been well understood, and the "brogue" has done me no harm. And I can assure my Harvard friend that his Teutonic lingualism is no hindrance to our comprehension of his winged words, but, on the other hand, it is a factor in his charming personality. He will be doubtless interested in being informed that recent observation proves that if Roumania and Nebraska learn Esperanto, and meet in a "so-called congress" in Geneva or elsewhere, they will get on together very pleasantly. Even the men who had only a writing knowledge of the lingvo conversed from the start by writing, and in a few days found themselves able to "interparol."

Another case which M. Beaufront reports is instructive. A party of Swedes went on some mission to Odessa, in Southern Russia, having only Swedish and Esperanto. At first nobody un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

derstood them, but the reporter of a newspaper took up the language, and in one day learned it sufficiently to get the message and to make use of it in next day's paper. These Swedes, and the Norwegians, who are always up to a good thing, are doing fine service of a missionary sort for the cause.

Remembering that some, like Zamenhof and Münsterberg, are grandly idealistic and poetical in their contact with this subject, I must confess that most of the crowd are only commonplace people who fancy that the international tongue can be of service one way or other. Of this sort I suppose are the army and navy officers, who hope to find it useful in their relations, friendly or otherwise, with outsiders; and the London business people, and County Councils, who are spreading it through the schools with small regard for its idealism; and the worthy Roman Catholic friends, like the French priests, who are said to be turning the Gospel of Mark into Esperanto; and men like Editor Peltier of Tours, and Dr. O'Connor of London, whose excellent text-book is used by many of us. These have been publishing a *Catholic Esperanto,* for religious purposes, and were recently commended by the Pope for their service. Their advertisement contains a recommendation of the language as useful to missionaries who are scattered afar, and who are now able to communicate only by writing in Latin. On seeing this notice it occurred to me that it would be good for our Protestant missionaries if we had a portion of the Gospels Esperantized, so that they and their assistants, always having the Gospels in their vernaculars, might easily learn the *lingvo* for mutual correspondence. Dr. Wherry, the Indian missionary, informs me that missionaries in Borneo are already using it for corresponding with their patrons in Europe.

On obtaining Mielck and Stephan's Gospel of St. Matthew in Esperanto, I found, whilst greatly pleased with it in many respects, that we could not use it without a thorough revision. And I devoted the summer months to this task, with the aid of Westcott & Hort's Greek Testament, and the English Revised Version. I have done the work in the cold-blooded, scientific fashion, and have to bear witness that in order to represent the Greek fairly in Esperanto I found it necessary only to invent two new words, one being *parablo,* for parable (the longer word *parabolo* has been preempted by mathematics); the other, curiously, is the word for priest, which I call *pretro* (after the French *prêtre*).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The explanation of this last word being required is that the Roman Catholics who have chiefly had matters in charge very properly prefer to call their modern priests by the Esperanto name for clergy generally, *pastro;* and as the New Testament has the two kinds, priests and pastors, I made a word for the former. In a few cases Esperanto gives a happier rendering of Greek than English provides. For example, the grape-clusters, which men do not gather from thistles, are called "grapes" in our English versions; and English has not two words to denote the difference between the two kinds of baskets used for the crumbs left after two different occasions of feeding the multitude. These delicate distinctions could not be shown in English save by using inelegancies.

GEORGE MACLOSKIE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ASPIRATIONS OF THE FOUNDER OF ESPERANTO.

Dr. Zamenhof's Address to the Second Esperanto Congress.

At the opening of our Congress you no doubt expect from me some sort of an address; perhaps you expect something formal, lifeless, empty, such as official addresses ordinarily are. Words of that kind, however, I am unable to give you. I never have been fond of such words, and particularly now, in the present year, such a colorless utterance would be a grave error on my part. I come to you from a land where many millions of men are at present engaged in fighting against great odds for freedom, for the very elements of human liberty, for the *rights of man*. I shall, however, not dwell upon that, for while you as men may follow with a certain interest the terrible battle now being waged in that land of many millions, yet, as Esperantists, you can in no wise be concerned in the struggle, for our Congress has no political significance whatsoever. But aside from the purely political struggle in that land, there is one going on in which we as Esperantists cannot but he interested; we see in that country cruel warfare between different nationalities. There it is not a case of one man attacking another, a foreigner, in the political interests of his fatherland, but a natural son of the land hurls himself like the savage beasts upon another son of the same land, only because he belongs to another sect. Every day many men die in the political battle, but every day many more die in this internecine race-war. Terrible is the state of affairs in the many-tongued Caucasus, and terrible it is in western Russia. Accursed, a thousand times accursed, be race hatred!

When still a child in the city of Bielystok, I used to observe with sorrow the mutual distrust that separates sons of the same land, the same city. I used to dream then that after a few years

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this condition would change for the better. A number of years have gone by since then, but instead of my beautiful dreams I beheld a dreadful sequel. In the streets of my unhappy native city savage men with axes and crowbars were hurling themselves like the wildest of beasts upon the peaceful inhabitants, whose only crime was that they spoke a different language and had a different religion from those savages. And for that the latter broke the heads and gouged the eyes of men and women, of the decrepit old people and the helpless children! I do not wish to give you a detailed account of the unspeakable Bielystok massacre. To you Esperantists I merely wish to say that the barriers between the nations are still appallingly high and thick, and it is these that we are laying siege to.

Every one knows that it is not the Russian people who are to blame for the horrible massacres at Bielystok and in many other cities; for the Russian people are never cruel or bloodthirsty. Every one knows that it is not the Tatars and Armenians that are to blame for the endless bloodshed, for both of these nationalities are peaceful people, with no desire to impose their rule upon any one else. All that they wish is to be allowed to live in peace. It is now perfectly clear that the blame rests upon a gang of vile criminals who contrive by all manner of ignoble means and by broadcast diffusion of lies and calumnies to create a fierce hatred among the different nationalities. But not even the worst of lies and slanders could produce such frightful results if only the various nationalities knew one another well, if only there were not between them those high and thick walls that prevent them from communicating freely and from seeing that the members of other nations are human beings like themselves. They would see that the literature of no nation preaches crime any more than does their own, that others have the same ethics, the same ideals as their own. Oh, break down the walls between the nations, give them the power of mingling freely and communicating on common ground, and then only will disappear that hatred which we see everywhere!

We are not nearly so naïve as some people think we are; we do not believe that the common ground we speak of will transform men into angels. We know well enough that evil men are just as apt to remain evil. But we believe that contact and communion on neutral ground will at least do away with that mass

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of outrages and crimes that are due not to ill-will, but simply to crass ignorance.

And now, with the cruel warfare raging in so many parts of the world, we Esperantists must work harder than ever. But in order that our labors might be the more fruitful, we must first of all be perfectly clear ourselves as to the basic idea of Esperantism. We all often allude to this idea in our work, in our speech, but we have never discussed it with much clearness. And now the time has come for us to speak of it more clearly and more precisely. By the unanimous Declaration at the Congress of Boulogne [the first Esperanto Congress, 1905] we all know what Esperantism signifies in its practical relations. We know also, by that Declaration, that "an Esperantist is any person, without exception, who uses the Esperanto language regardless of the purpose for which he uses it." An Esperantist, therefore, is not only that person who uses Esperanto solely and exclusively for practical purposes. Any one who employs Esperanto in order to make money is no less an Esperantist, and so is a person who uses it merely for amusement, and, finally, one who employs it for objects even less noble and good than these is also an Esperantist. But aside from the practical aspect that all accept, as is explained in the Declaration, Esperantism has still another side, by no means compulsory, but by far more important—the ideal side. And this aspect the various Esperantists can work out for themselves after their own divers fashions in all manner of varying shades. So that, in order to avoid any disagreement, the Esperantists have decided to allow every one absolute liberty to receive the inner idea of Esperantism in whatever fashion and degree it may best please him; or, if he be so minded, he need not trouble about any idea at all. In order to free some Esperantists from responsibility for the acts and ideals of other Esperantists the Declaration of Boulogne has defined the official and the unanimously accepted essence of Esperanto, and then added the following words: "Whatever other hope or dream any person may associate with Esperanto is a purely personal matter of the person in question, and for that Esperantism cannot answer." But in deprecating the word "personal" some of our Esperantist friends have read into it the sense "forbidden," and thus, instead of preserving the possibility of broad interpretation of the inner idea of Esperantism, they will kill it altogether.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If we, who are fighting for Esperanto, have of our own free will given the great world the right to look only upon the practical side of Esperanto and employ it for purely utilitarian purposes, that by no means gives any one the right to infer that we all look upon Esperanto as a merely utilitarian matter. It is regrettable that the last time some Esperantist voices were heard to say: "Esperanto is a language *only;* avoid even in private associating Esperantism with an *idea,* for otherwise people will think that we are all wedded to that idea and we shall displease many persons who do not like the idea." What words! Because we may possibly displease those people who wish to use Esperanto for purposes purely practical we must, forsooth, tear from our hearts that part of Esperantism which is the more important, more sacred, that idea which is the chief aim and business of Esperanto, the star that always guides all of us who are fighting for Esperanto! Oh, no, no, never! With energetic protest let us repudiate that request. If they mean to compel us, the pioneers of Esperanto, to drop the idea from our work, we shall indignantly tear up and burn all that we have written on behalf of Esperanto, we shall destroy in sorrow the labor and the sacrifices of our whole life, we shall cast away this green star* which sits upon our breast, and we shall cry with abomination: "With that kind of Esperanto, meant for commercial and utilitarian purposes only, we wish to have nothing to do." The time may come when Esperanto, having become the possession of all the world, will lose its ideal side; then it will be only a medium of communication; people will no longer fight its battles; they will merely derive benefits from it. But now, as nearly all Esperantists are still fighters rather than beneficiaries, we are all very well aware that in working for Esperanto we are dominated not by thoughts of its practical utility so much as by that greater, more sacred, weightier idea which underlies the international language. This idea is *brotherhood and justice among mankind.* That idea has accompanied Esperanto from the very moment of its birth to the present time. It dominated the author of Esperanto when he was still no more than a boy. Twenty-eight years ago, when a small band of students celebrated the first stirring into life of what is now Esperanto, they sang a song whose every verse was followed by the refrain—

* Official Esperanto badge.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Down, down, with the hatred of the nations,
For the time is at hand."

Our hymn speaks of "the new feeling that has come into the world," and all the works, all the words and acts of the author of Esperanto, as well as of all the Esperantists of to-day, unmistakably and always breathe the same idea. We have never concealed our idea; there could never have been the slightest doubt about it, for we have always talked about it and labored painstakingly on its behalf. Why, then, do people come to us who see in Esperanto "merely a language"? Why have they not the fear that the world will hold them to blame for a great crime, namely, the desire to help little by little toward the union of mankind? Do they not see that their words are contrary to their own inner feelings, and that unconsciously they, too, are dreaming the same dream that we are dreaming, although, through an unworthy fear, they try to deny it?

If I have passed the best part of my life, freely taking great pains and making great sacrifices without even reserving to myself the rights of authorship—did I do these things solely for utilitarian purposes? The pioneer Esperantists patiently exposed themselves not only to constant mockery, but even to great sacrifices. One poor teacher, for example, suffered hunger for a long time only in order that she might save a little money for the Esperanto propaganda—did all of them do these things for purely utilitarian reasons? If, again and again, people lying on their deathbeds write to me that Esperanto is the sole consolation of their expiring life, is it possible they think only of the practical uses? Oh, no, no! All remembered only the basic idea within Esperanto. All prized Esperanto not because it brings closer together the bodies or even the brains of mankind, but because it brings closer together the hearts of humanity.

You remember how enthusiastic we all were at Boulogne-sur-Mer. All those who took part in that Congress carried away the pleasantest and most enthusiastic memory of it for the rest of their lives; they all called it the "unforgettable Congress." What was it that made the members of the Congress so enthusiastic? Was it merely the amusements! No, indeed. At every step you can have much better amusements, see far better plays and have much finer music—not those of inexperienced amateurs, but of the best specialists. Was it the great talent of the speakers that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made us so enthusiastic? No, we had no speakers of that kind at Boulogne. Perhaps it was the fact that we understood one another? But in any congress of the same nationality we understand one another no less well, and yet we are never so enthusiastic. No, you all know very well that it was not the amusements in themselves, or the mutual understanding in itself, or even the practical utility of Esperanto, but that inner *idea* of Esperantism that we all felt within our hearts. We felt that the crumbling of the walls that separate humanity had commenced, we felt the spirit of universal brotherhood. We felt clearly enough that the utter disappearance of the walls was still far, far off, but we felt we were the witnesses of the first great attack upon those walls; we felt that before our eyes floated the phantom of a better future, a phantom still nebulous, indeed, but one which would become more and more substantial, more and more powerful.

Yes, my dear co-workers. To the indifferent world Esperanto can be only a matter of practical utility. Every one who uses Esperanto or who works in its behalf is an Esperantist; and every Esperantist has a perfect right to see in Esperanto merely a language, simple, unemotional, calculated to be understood by all the nations, like the marine signal code, though more perfect. These Esperantists will probably not come to our Congresses, or else they will come only for purposes of practical explanation or for a cold discussion of purely linguistic and academic questions; they will take no part in our joy and enthusiasm, which to them will perhaps seem naïve and childlike. But those Esperantists who have joined our movement not only with their heads, but also with their hearts, will always particularly feel and value the inner *idea* of Esperanto; they will not be afraid to be mockingly called Utopians by the world, or to have national chauvinists attack their ideal as though it were a crime. They will be proud of the name "Utopian." Every new Congress will strengthen their love for the underlying idea of Esperantism, and little by little our annual Congresses will become a continual feast of humanity and of human brotherhood.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MAXIME GORKY.

BY LOUISE COLLIER WILLCOX.

MAXIME GORKY is a noticeable personality, and a very great artist. In attempting any estimate of his genius and his influence, we have first to take into account that he comes from a far-away and an alien land. It would be difficult to find in the so-called civilized world another nation so temperamentally antipodal to the American as the Russian. It is even difficult to get exact information and make a true picture of the Russia of to-day, and perhaps it makes for our peace that our imagination has clipped wings and that no true realization reaches us. The Slav mind tends naturally to fanaticism; it is highly inflammable, and is often willing to suffer martyrdom for causes which we regard with silent approval or disapproval, and above all with patience, hoping that somehow, without any violence on our own part, right will ultimately prevail. Nihilism, which flourished between 1860 and 1870, was a demand for personal happiness and liberty, but it has practically died out and the revolutionary Socialist has held sway ever since. His demand is for the happiness of others and the future of his country. He aims at freeing the Russian people from autocracy and liberating the peasant, whose position now is radically worse than when he was a serf. His squalor and misery, his sufferings and outrageous poverty, his life broken by toil and deprivation, are sights to rouse heroes and make martyrs, and this they have done. The revolutionist is more than ready, he is eager, to die for the cause of the liberation of the people. The reforms of Alexander II proved useless, and the terms upon which a scrap of land was bestowed upon the serf were such as to cripple him with poverty and enslave him to lifelong toil. The sufferings of political prisoners, the horrible methods of torture used, are inconceivable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in our country. Whether it be the Slav temperament, or whether it be the awful power of suffering of a people having free access to European culture, and yet doomed to live in the worst evils of mediævalism, the Russian is penetrated with the most fundamental of sorrows, the sorrow over life as it is, over the essential contradiction between the real and the ideal; he eats out his soul at the inevitable hitch in the running of things; he steeps himself in chaotic dreams, and his sorrow is punctuated by anger against man, the social order and the Creator.

At the head of Russian literature of to-day and at the head of the revolutionary socialistic movement, stands Maxime Gorky, a man of amazing force and ability and of a twofold history, a personal life stranger than any he has yet depicted in his books and a literary career almost without parallel. For, whereas it took some decades for Tolstoy and Tourgeneff to win recognition, Gorky leaped into fame in less than a half-dozen years. He was a self-educated man; his first teacher was a cook on a river steamer, who gave him the "Lives of the Saints" to read, and later the works of Gogol, Ekkarthausen, Ouspensky and Dumas *père*.

"Write," Maxime Gorky instructed in a private letter, "write without fail that it was Korolenko who taught Gorky to write, and if Gorky learned little from Korolenko that was Gorky's fault. Write that the first teacher of Gorky was the cook Smourny, the second was the lawyer Lapin, the third, Kalioujny, a man outside the pale of society, and the fourth, Korolenko. I do not wish to write more of this. The memory of these great men touches me too nearly."

Gorky's childhood was hard and unnatural. His mother deserted him, his father died when the child was but four years old, of a disease caught while nursing him, and the maternal grandfather who brought him up, having reverses of fortune, sent the boy out to earn his own living in a shoe-shop when he was nine years old. It is not, however, fair to say that he is of peasant origin. His paternal grandfather was a colonel in the army of Nicholas I, and was dismissed on account of wanton cruelty to his soldiers at a time when very extraordinary cruelty would be necessary to attract notice. After Gorky left his grandfather's house, he never knew a home again until he had attained wealth and distinction. He was, at different

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

times, apprenticed to an ikon painter, worked in an underground bakeshop, sold *kwas* in the streets, and was assistant to a cook on a river boat and followed various callings of a like character.

"During all this time," he says, "I gave myself up with zeal to the reading of all the classical books I could lay hands on. After the age of fifteen, I conceived a wild desire to study, to know. I went to Kazan, supposing the sciences were gratuitously imparted to those who desired knowledge. Finding this was not so, I entered a bakery at three rubles a month." At nineteen, in despair, he attempted suicide and, being saved, once more took up the burden of life and sold apples in the streets. It was a sad career for a human being in the nineteenth century, but it was an eminently good preparation for the writer Gorky, for he saw all sorts and conditions of men, and he knew, not afar off, but by actual contact, their sufferings, their needs, their oppressions.

There are two picturesque scenes in young Gorky's life, just as he was about to reach manhood: one is that of his taking his first tale, "*Makár Chudra,*" to a provincial paper. The editor kept him standing while he read it through, then he looked up and said, "Yes, we'll take this," and then, turning it over, he added, "but you haven't signed it." "No," said the young Pieshkov. "Sign it," said the editor. "Sign it 'Gorky'" (which means bitter), said the youth. "'Gorky' and what else?" asked the editor. "Just 'Maxime Gorky.'"

Another picture is that given by a railroad official near Zaryzin, where at one time Gorky worked. The account was published in "*l'Instruction*":

"He [Gorky] was very exact in all his work. Recognizing him as a man of solid ability, we proposed to promote him to the weighing-machines, with a salary of twenty-five rubles a month. But he spent his money very strangely; as we all said, very foolishly, distributing it amongst the employees who had families, and the poor, giving a ruble here, or twenty-five kopecks there. He spent a great deal, too, on stamps, keeping up a vast correspondence; receiving letters every day, no one knew from where or from whom, and we were much interested and puzzled.

"During the leisure hours he could be seen surrounded by a crowd of workmen, talking on some instructive subject or reading a pamphlet aloud—moral, geographical, historical, astronomical; initiating his au-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ditors into the reality of the world and its phenomena. He pleased them much, for they were constantly seeking him out, and his speech was in fact always alert and picturesque. Meanwhile, it happened that we, his chiefs, became acquainted with Pieshkov. Reading a novel or some other work—I do not remember what—I chanced upon a passage about the freemasons; not understanding it, I asked the station-master for an explanation, as I took him to be the most likely man in the lot. He could not satisfy me. He said he had read things about the masons, but didn't really understand their doctrine. Just at this time, the overseer of the scales, young Pieshkov came up and, addressing himself to the station-master, said: 'Will you permit me to explain?' 'Do you know anything about freemasons?' 'I've read about them and I remember what I've read.' Then he fairly gave a lecture on freemasons, with such circumstantial details that I asked myself where on earth he could have gathered them. As I have said, he was a fascinating talker, and we were so interested that we should have been in danger of forgetting the trains, the station-master and I, had there been any then, but there were not. Two hours passed us; when Pieshkov left the station-master said to me 'Do you know, I believe young Pieshkov is an expelled student; he is far too intelligent for a baker or a scullion, and how he has read! I trust we'll have no misfortune on account of him! For the rest, luck go with him!'

"After this the station-master used to invite him to his home as a friend. Pieshkov would pass the time with us without the slightest embarrassment, smoking his cigarette and surprising us more and more with his knowledge and with his wide reading, so that we decided positively that he was a student expelled from the university.

"His work on the railroad lasted only a few months. One day he appeared at the office and asked for his wages, announcing that he was to leave. I paid him what was due and offered him a third-class ticket anywhere on the road that he might wish to go. He refused the ticket, saying he preferred to travel afoot. Pulling his hat down over his eyes and throwing his baggage on his back, he started off along the line, after friendly farewells to all the employees and workmen, who hurried around this man who had amused and instructed them for months.

"Some time ago, the works of Maxime Gorky fell into my hands, and as I read them something familiar but long forgotten seemed to hover about me. Finally, I saw a portrait of the author, and then I recognized my old comrade in the service."

From the beginning of the publication of his stories, Gorky realized that he had found his work, and from the start he had recognition. Before that, he had had but a vague and floating idea of aiding in some social and political revolution, vowing inwardly to become in himself "a great, active, social force." As soon as he began to write he understood how he could best

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

influence people and what he had to do in the world. He has published some eight or ten volumes of short stories, helped edit a paper, published three novels and three very remarkable plays, as well as magazine articles and short pieces of various kinds. There is nothing of the dilettante in Gorky's method of work. When he is writing he can work fifteen or sixteen hours at a stretch daily, only stopping to take such refreshment as is brought and put beside him. In his indomitable and irrepressible will power there is something that reminds one of Kipling; Gorky, too, has entered that warfare without discharge in which dreams are transformed into words, in which the creative will draws without end and without lassitude visible images in the concrete world. Gorky was a man born into the world an outcast and a superfluity, huddled out of all doors as mere scum and drift of humanity, and yet by his unaided efforts he has raised himself to the most prominent place in Russian literature, a literature that stands high among the literatures of the world. If in his aggressive will power he reminds one of Kipling, it is only in that, for the doctrines of the two men are diametrically opposed; as Kipling believes in egoism and imperialism, so Gorky believes in altruism and liberty. His personality is impressive as that of a great thinker, but it is also impressive as that of a man who is bearing the "wronged world's weight" and who has put by all personal fear and desire. Tall and slender and awkward, with the square Slav head and face, heavy brown hair thrown back from a full, broad, much-lined forehead, a square jaw and projecting chin, deep-set, tragic, gray eyes, an ugly nose and a delicate, thin-lipped mouth, no mere enumeration of feature can do much to describe one of the saddest and the noblest of faces, a face that without smiling yet radiates benevolence and gentleness whenever he speaks. Impatient of all insincerities and hypocrisies, without guile or concealment, with something of the aggressiveness of youth in the face of pretension or cowardice or conformity, he is not a man to win popularity here, although in Russia he is the idol of the people; the idol, because he has laid bare the multiple vision of their wrongs and their sufferings. When he was imprisoned in 1905, a protest, signed by the most distinguished names in Europe, was sent in to the Russian Government demanding his release, lest Russia, nay, all Europe, lose one of its finest geniuses.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So much for his life; the last incident of it is too well known to need comment. Gorky himself is one of those who rebound from discouragement. There is something softening in universal acclaim and sympathy. The journalistic persecution of one of the world's greatest geniuses cut off Gorky's appeal to the people here for Russia, but it turned him back upon himself and set him writing the greatest novel he has yet attempted, a novel dealing with the aristocracy, the *bourgeoisie,* the peasant and the outbreak of the revolution. It is called "The Mother," and, if one may fairly make predictions for a novel but half written, it will indeed be one of the great epoch-making works.

No one who has read Gorky doubts that he is a very great artist. As a man of letters, though he is but thirty-seven years old, his place is as much assured as that of Tolstoy or Tourgeneff. From the first little story, "*Makár Chudra,*" the finished artist is present. While there is in this tale a more romantic setting than Gorky ever allowed himself again, the chief features of his genius are already strongly marked; his admiration for strength, for sheer physical prowess and skill; his rating of freedom as higher than life or love; his keen vision, sensibility to music, but above all his feeling for man and nature as integral parts of one whole—for only so can one express that feeling for nature which seems, like a quality in the air, to have penetrated all lands and peoples in the last century, a feeling very different from the so-called love of nature of other centuries, of the posed and affected convention about nature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Nature is the great setting for little human incidents, the whole in which men scurry hither and yon, bent on their little activities, but it is also the great way of flight, the other and the deeper self into which man escapes from his petty finitude, his limitations; it is the largeness and the peace from which he divorces himself at his peril. Throughout these stories there is the haunting sound of the sea, the wind of the steppes blowing. Gorky's vagabond, wandering over the earth, living from hand to mouth, is a vital fact and an outcome of Russian semi-civilization; but there is, moreover, an undercurrent of half-symbolic interpretation; it is the human soul beating its wings against the bars of its narrow cage, yearning out into something nearer the infinite, restless at its flesh confinement and its narrow limitations. There is a little tale

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about a finch which shows the symbolism more clearly than elsewhere:

"During an awful stillness in the forest, there sounded a wonderful song; the daring singer complained of the darkness and narrow-mindedness of the fettered life in the woods and declared war on the gods. All the birds flew together to the spot from which the marvellous song came, and to their surprise they found only a little vagabond finch. He summoned the birds to follow him, to leave the dark woods and damp marshes, and to turn away from all cowardice and questioning; but the practical professor of modern history—the woodpecker—said it would be useless to fly away, for, he said, beyond the forest is only a field, empty in summer and covered with snow in winter, and at the other end of the field lives Grisha, the bird-catcher. The poor finch didn't know what to say and in his defence he could only murmur: 'Yes, I lied. I didn't truly know what lay beyond the coppice, but it makes one so happy to believe and to hope. Perhaps the woodpecker is right, but what is the use of his truth; it weighs like a stone on the wings and keeps one from flying high, high, out into the heavens.'"

From the very beginning, Gorky's hero, in the guise of a gypsy, a vagabond, a thief, a wanderer, a dweller in basements and cellars, is yet the human spirit going forth on its own adventure into the world of nature and of ideals, ever further, never complacent, never satisfied, never wholly at ease in the flesh that confines it, ever seeking its liberty.

"*Makár Chudra,*" that first story which the young boy took to the provincial newspaper, opens with the outer world, the great, free, limitless setting against which the little human life huddles, hardly daring to look out:

"In from the sea blew a wet, cold wind, bearing the melancholy music of the tide pounding the shore, and the rustling of the low beach bushes, out over the steppes. From time to time the dust blew wrinkled, frozen, yellowish leaves right into our fire. The overhanging mists of the autumn night trembled and from time to time shrank up on the one side or the other, and then for an instant, out to the left, one could see the illimitable prairie, or, to the right, the limitless sea, and straight in front just opposite me I watched the powerful form of Makár Chudra."

There from the first is the hand of the literary artist; the complete framework of the gypsy's romantic tale of the young wanderer who, rather than submit to the servitude of passion, killed his beloved because he loved her, and then thanked her father for killing him, because death is better than slavery. The final lines bring back again the scene in which the story is laid:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The rain fell faster, and the sea's song was a sad and solemn hymn in honor of that brave, proud gypsy pair—Loika and Radda, the daughter of the old soldier. And the two of them seemed to be soaring still and dumb through the night's darkness, and however swift the spirit of the beautiful singer sped, yet he never quite touched his beloved."

This was the first story. As the work progressed the tendency has been ever more and more away from any conventionally constructed story, more and more toward some bit of life realistically conceived, minutely described, the whole attention riveted upon the exact truth, life as it actually is. Alas, Gorky's eyes have been fixed upon the pain, upon the anguish, upon the brutal cruelties of life; and he himself says that the flaw in his work is that it cannot give joy, which is the greatest function of art. But at least his work does perform the function of tragedy, it purges the emotions by portraying scenes of terror and pity. The minute analysis of pain, of dull grieving, as in *"L'Angoisse,"* of the brutal amusements of bored and isolated people, as in *"Par Ennuie,"* of the sudden outbursts of human tenderness and pity, as in "Once in Autumn," these stand out penetrating, precise, eloquent. Gorky can put himself into the most secret and intricate workings of the human mind, and show how the thought turns in upon itself, haunted by the dull futility or sordid meanness of the daily routine. Thought, held in a net and forced to move circlewise, ever asking the question: "Why? why? Why am I here?" receiving no answer and yet seeing no escape from the awful, insistent question that may invade any soul at any instant: "What is it for?" In the first story the old gypsy warns the youth against this awful introspection which paralyzes activity:

"Look, as the day chases the night and both flee round and round the earth, so must you flee all thought about life, and then you'll not cease to love it, but once one begins to question, to ferret into its meanings, you get very tired of life. It's always so. It was that way with me. Yes, yes, young falcon, even so with me."

Another theme of the earlier stories is the brave and beautiful *camaraderie* among the unfortunates, as in "The Ex-Men," the loyal tenderness between the captain and the teacher, or in "The Chums," the devotion even unto death of the two congenial pilferers. It is as if Gorky were saying: "Everywhere, at least, there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is the soul; we cannot fall so low but that there is the gleam of beauty and of selfishness which makes the creature human."

Any one who turns back to the books of Tourgeneff and remembers his dreamy, intellectual, will-paralyzed heroes, must note the marked difference in the modern type. Either the typical Slav is a very Hamlet by innate tendency, or the strangely slow emerging from barbarism of the nation has created Hamlets. They are a people restrained on all sides in their activities and yet free to think and gifted with abundant mentality. In revolt against this tendency, all Gorky's later works are calls to action. He defines the socialistic doctrines in the "Family Bezsémenoff," his earliest play; and the adopted son, Nil, is the man of action, the man no longer content with analysis, emotions, dreams, but determined to mould life according to his will, to act and to get results. He says:

> "I know that life is painful, that at moments it is villainously cruel, that a frenetic power, gross and ruthless, crushes man, I know it and I don't like it and I'm going to rebel. I want no such order. *I don't want it!* Life is a serious thing but not yet organized. . . . Life exacts for such organization all my powers and all my capacities. I'm not a giant, but I'm an honest and a healthy man, and so I say to myself: Never mind! We'll conquer yet! And with every capacity of my soul I'm going to penetrate to the depths of life; I'm going to pick it up and knead it this way and that, prevent some things and help on others. . . . And see! that and that only is the joy of living."

So Gorky utters the call to the will to come out and strive for the joy of creating, of kneading life this way and that, preventing evil things and helping on good ones. For, whatever other forms of life there may be, human life is struggle, and joy is in choosing the better side, and in keeping actively in the thick of the fight.

There is no space here to make an analysis of Gorky's novels, those wonderful pictures of *bourgeois* life. The famous play, however, "The Night Lodgings," must be considered as being one of the most powerful outgrowths of Gorky's genius. This play ran two hundred nights in Berlin and two seasons in Moscow, where it was performed at the famous Artists' Theatre, and where Madame Pieshkov, Gorky's wife, together with some other amateurs, took part in a real play for the first time. It is not easy to get an impression of the enthusiasm the play excited, even from the criticisms that occurred at the time. It is difficult to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

put into words the tremendous impression of force, of massive, deep-seeing genius, that one gets from the mere reading of the play. The Moscow correspondent of the St. Petersburg "Novosti" wrote:

"Here in Moscow there has been an event which demands relation. It is the overwhelming, the extraordinary, the unheard-of success of Maxime Gorky's 'Night Lodgings.' I call it an event, because this new success of the famous Maxime is a veritable revolution. . . . He has shown himself a powerful sovereign of human thought."

In the same review the writer, M. Rackchanine, says:

"If such an appeal for the sanctity of the human being as such were to sound from the pulpit of a cathedral or from the chair of a university, it would produce a very poignant emotion; but the impression is an hundred times stronger when the words sound in the putrid atmosphere of low night lodgings, and it is in this appeal—mark you—that the whole significance of the play lies."

As in life and in doctrine Gorky accepts no disguises, no concealments, no conventions, so in this play, too, he has laid aside every conventional formula, every structural tradition. There is apparently no beginning, no middle or climax of complication, no end. There is a succession of scenes, scenes of absolute and convincing reality. A close student only will notice the subtlety with which each speaker's first words are chosen. They fall so naturally into the play that only after many readings does one realize how entirely they introduce the character, are an essential part of the individuality, and are such as that character only could have spoken.

The night lodgings are in a cellar. The ceiling is vaulted and of stone, plastered over in patches and badly smoked. A small square window is letting in, at the opening of the play, the first gray light of daybreak. There are beds all round the room, a door leading into the kitchen where three or four of the lodgers dwell, and an antechamber belonging to the thief. In this space there are fifteen to twenty habitual night lodgers. Those who are the principal speakers in the play are the keeper of the lodgings, a pious miser of fifty-four, superstitious, suspicious and hard, but well able to collect his debts; there is his fierce and shrewish young wife, Vasilissa, of twenty-six, who is in love with the thief, Pepel, the richest, the cleverest, the most highly considered of all the lodgers. Pepel, by the irony of fate's purposes, is in love with Vasilissa's sister, Natasha, the heroine, if any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one can be considered to play a greater part than another in this strangely human play where one destiny is just as important as the next. Consenting finally to become the *fiancée* of Pepel, she is practically scalded to death by her jealous sister, and in the end we are left in doubt whether she is dead, in a hospital, or has simply disappeared from sight. Kleshtch is a locksmith, who inhabits one corner of the room and files keys diligently, while his wife Anna is dying of consumption in the bed with the curtains. Kleshtch is a dull, hard-working, unintelligent and brutal churl, promising himself release from sordid deprivation once he is rid of his wife. Though he bears her dying with nonchalance, yet the sight of death so overwhelms him that he is moved to sell his tools and to bury her, and is then left without money, without tools, and without escape from his corner. Anna dies in the beginning of the second scene, which is concerned mainly with the reflections upon death of the lodgers and their heartless haste to get rid of the body. Luke is the passing stranger whose faith is in the imagination or in the thought *about* life. He says, a man will be what you call him, and so his greeting when he enters is, "Good health to you, honest friends." He soothes Anna's dying moments with promises of heaven; he tells the actor, whose great boast, and excuse likewise, is that his entire organism is poisoned through and through with alcohol, of the great free sanatorium where he can be cured, and where his powers and his memory can be given back to him; he promises Natasha that if she will but believe in the honor and the purity of the thief, he will be pure and honest, and he promises Pepel a new life of peace and virtuous gain and true domesticity with Natasha. To one and the other he goes saying that the one reality is one's belief about things. He tells Satine, the cynic, that God exists if only we have faith in Him. Satine, however, was introduced saying: "Words, words, I've had enough of them, brother, enough of all the human words. Words bore me. I've heard each one of them at least a thousand times." And again he says: "Give me five kopecks and I'll believe anything, that you're a genius, a hero, a crocodile, a commissary of the police, Kleshtch —just give me the five kopecks."

In these two characters one sees the two extremes of idealism and realism. It is interesting to look over the reviews and see how few of the critics have at all made out what Luke is supposed,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with his kindly words, his dreamy faiths, his gentle veilings of reality, to accomplish. Many writers upon the play have taken him to represent the solution of the awful human tragedy. But he is really intended to expedite the catastrophe. Once thoroughly understanding Gorky's strange stand against idealism, one will not be so apt to mistake this most subtle bit of work. In the beginning, when Luke is reproached for annoying the other occupants by singing and singing ill, he replies: "Well, so it is. A man goes about by himself thinking how well I'm doing, and all the time the others are thinking 'what a nuisance he is'!"

It is for this desire to turn the current of life from the present to the future, from the immediate need to an unreal spiritual exaltation, that Gorky blames Tolstoy. Gorky's theory of life is to face the bare facts square in the face, and then to "knead life this way and that," not for one's own gain, but for the good of humanity. There are many scenes in this wonderful play of poignant pathos, but it is impossible to treat them at length. That, for example, in which Nastia, the young woman who, in all these miseries, feeds herself day and night on cheap romances, tries to tell the others the tale of *"L'Amour Fatal"* as her own experience, and is hooted at by the audience because the hero of the love adventure is Raoul in the first part of the story and Gaston in the other. To her Luke says: "Never mind, come away, it's all nothing; don't be grieved. I know, and I believe you. It's you who have the truth of this, not they! If you believe you once had a veritable love, well, then, it existed; yes, it existed."

Over and over, with biting satire, Gorky points out the failure of the idea by itself; only when it is acted upon, only when belief is carried out into a concrete form, is it worth while.

The step from Tourgeneff, the last great Russian to hold our attention, to Gorky is very great. Tourgeneff was a supreme craftsman, but he had folded his hands as far as life went. His sole business was in depicting it, and this he did, exquisitely but sadly, as does a man who has renounced hope; but Gorky's work, with its horrors and its anguish, is a trumpet call to action. Life, he feels, is not a thing to despair of, not a thing to sit still and frame theories about, life is the thing which we pick up in our hands and "knead this way and that."

LOUISE COLLIER WILLCOX.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CREDIT CURRENCY.

BY A. B. HEPBURN, PRESIDENT OF THE CHASE NATIONAL BANK, NEW YORK, FORMERLY COMPTROLLER OF THE UNITED STATES CURRENCY.

A COMMISSION created by the American Bankers' Association, consisting of fifteen representative bankers from various parts of the country, representing National and State banks, savings-banks, trust companies and private bankers, recently convened in Washington, and, after much deliberation, formulated principles and unanimously recommended a plan for improving the currency. It is not a comprehensive, scientific plan, but one involving simple changes in present law which, it is believed, will prove of material advantage to the business interests of the country. The essential feature of the plan, and the one destined to provoke the greatest discussion, is the recommendation for a credit currency. The Commission says:

"We are unanimously of the opinion that changes in the existing bank-note system are imperatively required. We find that the present volume of bank-notes is wholly unresponsive to the demands of commerce. It does not expand with the need for currency in the crop-moving period, causing stringency, nor contract when the uses for currency are less extensive, causing redundancy. We find that the banks are under the necessity of parting with their reserve money to supply the demand for currency at certain seasons, although that demand would be quite as well satisfied if banks could supply their credit notes instead of depleting their reserves and causing a contraction injurious to business."

And, to remedy this defect, the Commission recommends:

"1. Any national bank having been actively doing business for one year and having a surplus fund equal to twenty per cent. of its capital shall have authority to issue credit notes as follows, subject to the rules and regulations to be determined by the Comptroller of the Currency:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"(*a*) An amount equal to 40 per cent. of its bond-secured circulation, subject to a tax at the rate of 2½ per cent. *per annum* upon the average amount outstanding. . . .

"(*b*) A further amount equal to 12½ per cent. of its capital, subject to a tax at the rate of 5 per cent. *per annum* upon the average amount outstanding in excess of the amount first mentioned.

"2. The same reserves shall be carried against credit notes as are now required by law to be carried against deposits."

The plan also provides a 5-per-cent. guarantee fund to be contributed by the banks taking out circulation at the inception, which shall be kept good by imposing a tax upon the circulation issued, and out of that fund the Government shall redeem the notes of all failed banks, immediately upon presentation. The notes of all solvent banks are to be redeemed at "numerous redemption cities, conveniently located in various parts of the country," to be designated by the Comptroller of the Currency. The present bank-notes are good beyond question, but their volume is in no degree responsive to the varying demands of business; no bond-secured circulation ever can be. In order to take out $100,000 circulation under the present law, a bank must first purchase, and deposit with the United States Treasurer, $100,000 in Government bonds. The present cost of these bonds would be $104,000. The bank, therefore, is compelled to invest in bonds $4,000 more than it is permitted to issue in notes, thereby impairing, instead of increasing, its ability to serve the commercial needs of the public by taking out circulation.

That the proposed notes would be good beyond peradventure is a conclusion that must follow a candid analysis of the plan. A bank-note is a demand obligation, in principle and in practical effect essentially the same as a bank deposit. A bank deposit represents a specific voluntary act on the part of the depositor; a bank-note is issued in form convenient for transmission from hand to hand; its reception, however, is wholly voluntary, and yet, being allowed to circulate as money, it is the bounden duty of the Government authorizing the same to see that the ultimate redemption of such notes is placed beyond doubt or delay. The National banks, at the present time, have deposits placed with them by the public amounting to $5,897,777,000. The banks are required to keep cash reserves against such deposits—25 per cent. in cash in central reserve cities; in reserve cities, 25 per cent., one-half in cash in bank and one-half with an approved reserve

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agent in a central reserve city; other banks are required to keep 15 per cent. reserve, two-fifths of which must be in cash in bank and three-fifths of which may be with an approved reserve agent. The banks are required to make five sworn reports of conditions annually, and to publish the same, and compliance with the law is enforced by supervision and regular examination. With the growing wealth of the community at large, the principal element of banking power has come to be deposits, which, in the National system, are more than four times the capital and surplus. Deposits with National banks, these demand liabilities, have grown regularly and continually since the organization of the system —from $725,000,000 in 1866 to $5,897,000,000 in 1906—and public confidence has grown with them. These demand liabilities, deposits, increased by $382,000,000 during the year ending October last, and nobody thought that the banks were weakened thereby. The plan under consideration contemplates the issue of currency against the credit, the financial responsibility, of the banks, in an amount not exceeding 25 per cent. of the capital stock, at a fair rate of taxation (2½ per cent.), and an amount equal to 12½ per cent. of the capital stock, at 5-per-cent. taxation, such currency to be protected by the same reserves as are required against deposits, and also by a 5-per-cent. guarantee fund maintained in the Treasury of the United States. Should every bank avail itself of the maximum privilege at the same time, a most improbable if not inconceivable happening, such currency, such demand liabilities, would thereby be increased far less than the demand liabilities of the banks were increased last year by the growing volume of deposits.

The popular misunderstanding of the currency question is largely due to the fact that the public does not realize that the liability of a bank is essentially the same whether it issues a bank-note, title to which passes by delivery, a certificate of deposit, a Cashier's check, title to which passes by endorsement, or grants an open credit upon its books. They are all demand liabilities, and must be redeemed in lawful money when required. The history of the National banking system for forty-two years shows that an annual tax of one-fourth of one per cent. levied upon outstanding bank-note circulation would have raised an amount more than sufficient to have redeemed every note of every failed bank, and that, too, without reference to the Government

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bonds deposited as security. This plan provides a guarantee fund at the outset of 5 per cent., which is to be maintained from the proceeds of taxation. From this fund the Government must immediately redeem the notes of all failed banks, which may be presented; of course going banks will redeem their own.

Vital statistics covering a period of years enable life-insurance companies to conduct their business with safety and reasonable certainty. Data covering destruction of property by fire in the past enables fire-insurance companies to gauge with reasonable certainty the losses of the future, and to predicate their business with safety thereupon. Bank mortality is much more easily and accurately ascertained. As to no business in the country do we possess such exact information as we do with reference to banks. If, then, the business of the life and fire insurance companies can be safely predicated upon the statistics of the past, it is idle to argue that the proposed credit currency will not be rendered safe beyond peradventure by the guarantee fund provided, to say nothing of reserve. The plan properly gauges the authorized currency in proportion to the amount of circulation secured by Government bonds. British Consols, paying 2¾ per cent. interest, sell at 86¾, and German Imperial 3-per-cents. sell at 85; United States 2-per-cents. sell at 103½. The reason of this is, not that the financial credit of the United States is so much better than that of England or Germany, but that United States bonds are usable as a basis for bank circulation, issued at par and subject to the very low tax of one-half of one per cent. *per annum*. The very low interest rate at which the Government has its indebtedness carried and the very high price at which it is able to sell its bonds (the last issue of Panama bonds averaging 104), represent, in effect, a contribution to the Treasury of the United States by the National banking system. But for their use as a basis of circulation, these bonds would approximate the same level in price as the obligations of other first-class nations. The higher the credit of a nation the higher the credit of its citizens; the proposed plan, therefore, wisely guards against the depreciation of Government bonds by proportioning the credit currency thereupon. The plan provides for the issue of 12½ per cent. of a bank's capital without relation to bond-secured notes, subject to a tax of 5 per cent. A 5-per-cent. tax with 25-per-cent. reserve would make such currency cost the banks 6¼

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

per cent., not including the expense, clerical and otherwise, in issuing, handling and redeeming such notes. Manifestly, such currency would be used only in emergency. Let us see how the plan would work. A New York bank with $5,000,000 capital, in order to avail itself of the maximum of credit currency, would take out 62½ per cent. of its capital in currency secured by United States bonds, $3,125,000; credit notes (2½ per cent.), $1,250,000; emergency notes (5 per cent.), $625,000; total, $5,000,000. Without taking out any bond-secured notes or any low-tax credit notes, such bank might, in an emergency, issue the $625,000 subject to the 5-per-cent. tax and thus, under the sanction of law, afford the public the relief which has heretofore been crudely and partially afforded by the use of Clearing-House certificates. I say "crudely and partially," for the use of Clearing-House certificates amounts to a suspension of currency payments as between banks, and thus savors somewhat of repudiation of contracts. Clearing-House certificates are no longer available as a means of relief. Their issue by any city would be hailed as a danger-signal, and would divert from such city a greater amount, in exchanges withheld, than could possibly be equalled in the use of Clearing-House certificates. The maximum amount of Clearing-House certificates issued by New York at any one time is $41,490,000. The daily exchanges of the New York Clearing-House last year averaged over $300,000,000. The fear of Clearing-House certificates and inability to collect in currency would induce the withholding of exchanges and the diversion to other points of an enormous amount. Besides, we have become a World Power in matters of finance, and the world must know that any funds deposited can be withdrawn any time and in any form at the option of the depositor. It is, therefore, of the highest importance that the Government provide instrumentalities for preventing an emergency, if possible, and tiding it over if it must come. The currency, subject to the lower tax, would enable the banks in different sections of the country to meet quietly and satisfy the local demand, thereby preventing the situation from becoming acute. What we really need is a currency that will prevent emergencies. Business should, however, have the additional safeguard of a highly taxed, expensive currency that may be resorted to in cases of extreme need. The criticism is made that the tax of 2½ per cent. is too low; that the interior banks

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would issue this currency and keep it out all the while; that it would amount to inflation. If that be true, the rate of taxation should be increased; but let it be remembered that the cost of redemption is very considerable and somewhat difficult to estimate. The cost of issuing and redeeming a note which remains outstanding only three days is quite as great as if it remained out a year, and, with proper facilities for redemption, the Commission believes it impossible to keep this currency out for any considerable length of time. The National bank-notes presented for redemption last year amounted to $278,550,060; of this amount, $136,252,360 was presented from New York City and $50,000,000 from Boston, Philadelphia and Baltimore. Under the present law, National bank-notes are redeemed in Washington, and the reason there are not more presented for redemption is found in the expense and the loss of interest incident thereto. The reason that so great a proportion is presented from near-by places is because of the lessened cost and the fact that reserve money is received in exchange therefor. The present bank-notes circulate in the city of New York only so long as they remain in the hands of the people. As soon as they are deposited with the banks they are forwarded to Washington for redemption, and, in exchange therefor, money is received which counts in a bank's reserve. With redemption agencies established in every State in the Union, so that this credit currency would always be within twenty-four hours of a redemption agency, it is certain to be presented for redemption. Every bank, where bank currency is available, will use its own notes and send in the other banks' notes for redemption, instead of paying them out over their counter, as now.

The fear that this currency will be put out by interior banks and kept out is dissipated in the light of experience. They cannot keep it out. The average life of a credit note, with ample redemption facilities, is in sharp contrast to the life of our bond-secured notes redeemable at Washington, on the extreme eastern border of the country, and is well illustrated by the following averages:

	Days
The note of the Scotch banking system remains out	18
" " " Canadian banking system remains out	30
" " " New England (Suffolk) banking system remains out.	45
" " " National banking system remains out	730

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Dominion of Canada is composed of provinces and enjoys the advantages of a credit currency. Her bank-notes were at a discount in the different provinces until a Dominion law required redemption agencies to be maintained in each province; since then they have passed at par. With our wonderful facilities for transportation, is it not fair to assume, then, that the average life of a credit note in this country would not exceed thirty days?

The charge that this currency would be utilized by the New York banks in the interest of Wall Street is wholly without foundation. Neither bank-notes nor any other form of currency enter into Wall Street transactions. Such transactions are consummated by means of checks. Reserve money may be the basis of credit extended to Wall Street, but bank-notes cannot be, and, as we have seen, as soon as National bank-notes reach the banks they are forwarded to Washington for redemption and reserve money received therefor. Hence the proposed currency is not a device in the interest of Wall Street. The practical operation of the law would, I think, be this: During crop-moving periods, the banks outside of reserve cities would first utilize their power to issue notes in order to satisfy the demand made upon them, instead of calling, as now, upon reserve cities for currency. Their power in that respect utilized, the reserve cities might, in turn, issue currency; and, if the demand increased, a point might be reached where central reserve cities could issue currency and keep the same in circulation until the crop-moving period had passed, or other demand, whatever its occasion, had been satisfied. The benefit which would accrue to New York, Chicago, St. Louis and other money centres would be indirect, in removing or relieving the demand upon their reserve money, which every fall brings around. This fact cannot be too strongly emphasized, that ample redemption facilities, with the general redemption which would follow, is a complete answer to the charge that the proposed currency would amount to inflation, and that interior banks would keep the maximum out at all times. They could not keep it out unless the business demand for currency was pronounced and extreme, and then it should be kept out in the interest of the general welfare. Whenever the money rates relax and the currency demand lessens, it would flow in for redemption. That is proven by experience where credit currency has been and is being used. The self-interest of each bank will facilitate the redemption of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the notes of all other banks. The best of our old State banks vindicated credit currency; notably, the saving-fund system in New York and the Suffolk system in New England. Belgium, Germany, France, Austria, Scotland and Canada, by their systems now in operation, afford practical proof that the proposed currency plan is both safe and wise. Our present currency law was enacted by Congress more than forty years ago, for the avowed purpose of making a market for Government bonds, which were made a basis for circulation. Our Government enjoys the highest credit enjoyed by any nation, and its bonds are eagerly sought, and yet the currency law remains unchanged. We are the greatest commercial nation, and yet our currency is least adapted to the varying needs of commerce. The adoption of credit currency in this country is inevitable; is it not wise to take a lesson from our competitors in world commerce and inaugurate a change now?

A. B. HEPBURN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

BY RICHARD LE GALLIENNE, H. W. BOYNTON AND OLIVIA HOWARD DUNBAR.

MR. ALFRED NOYES'S POEMS.*

FINE poetry is by no means so rare to-day as some conventionally discouraging people would have it. Poetry is as much alive as ever it was, and the muses walk the earth just as of old for those who have eyes to see them. With the passing of any one generation of great poets, the cry has always gone up that poetry has died with it. So, strangely enough, thought Tennyson, when, as a boy, in his Lincolnshire garden, he heard of the death of Byron, little dreaming that, at his own death, the same cry would go up from a world that can only appreciate the poetry to which it has grown accustomed. Even Keats himself, but a few years before, had announced that glory and loveliness had passed away—at the very moment when he was about immortally to prove the contrary. So, however apparently bleak the contemporary prospect, we never know what sudden surprises of beauty are being prepared for us underground. We have had several such surprises within the last very few years. "There are no poets nowadays," said one old lady to another in a railway carriage in which I happened to be travelling on the morning of the death of Tennyson. As she spoke, I sat opposite to her reading Mr. William Watson's "Wordsworth's Grave." Mr. Kipling also was already vigorously abroad in the world. The fairy harp of Mr. Yeats had long been making its lovely music; and Mr. Stephen Phillips was standing on the threshold of his fame. It is strange that we should have so little faith in nature, not to be sure that what she has done once she can always do again.

* Poems. By Alfred Noyes, with an Introduction by Hamilton W. Mabie. New York: The Macmillan Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The poets I have mentioned are long since securely "arrived," and, in the mean time, while their fames were in the making, a young Oxford man, Mr. Alfred Noyes, was rowing in his college eight, and preparing still another surprise for those old ladies who say that there are no poets nowadays. Mr. Noyes, I understand, is only twenty-six years old, and has already published five volumes of verse: "The Loom of the Years," 1902; "The Flower of Old Japan," 1903; "Poems," 1904; "The Forest of Wild Thyme," 1905; and "Drake: an English Epic," 1906. The volume of "Poems" which has just been published in this country consists, I gather from Mr. Mabie's preface, partly of poems selected from those five volumes, and partly of original poems. So much of merely bibliographical details.

A new poet is perhaps always best "appreciated" by being allowed to speak for himself, rather than by eulogy; and I propose, so far as my space allows, to give the reader the opportunity of passing his own judgment on Mr. Noyes's poems instead of asking him to take mine—for I am sure that he will not need me to point out their spontaneous power and freshness, their imaginative vision, their lyrical magic.

Mr. Noyes is surprisingly various. I have seldom read one book, particularly by so young a writer, in which so many different things are done, and all done so well. There, one is bound to say, Mr. Noyes is refreshingly distinguished from some others among our younger poets. His book opens with a sumptuous ode on "The Passing of Summer," made of lines such as these:

> "Tell us no more of Autumn, the slow gold
> Of fruitage ripening in a world's decay,
> The falling leaves, the moist, rich breath
> Of woodlands crumbling through a gorgeous death
> To glut the cancerous mould!
> Give us the flash and scent of keen-edged May,
> Where wastes that bear no harvest yield their bloom,
> Rude crofts of flowering nettle, bents of yellow broom."

A few pages further on you find him celebrating a London barrel-organ, in fascinating jingles. Highwaymen, Napoleon at St. Helena, Old Japan, Heine, pirates, Celtic legends, deep musings on life and death—all are grist to the mill of the eagerly creative, sensitive mind of this young poet. But that for which one is most grateful to Mr. Noyes in his strong and brilliant treat-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of all his rich material is the gift by which, in my opinion, he stands alone among the younger poets of the day, his lyrical gift. He is a singer, with the power of haunting our hearts with musical rhythm and cadence. A lover of poetry was remarking to me, the other day, on the strange dearth of lyrical poetry at the present time. Well, in Mr. Noyes, we have a new lyric poet, whatever else he may be besides—and he is much. Take these lines out of "Haunted in Old Japan":

> "*All along the purple creek lit with silver foam,*
> *Silent, silent voices, cry no more of home;*
> *Soft beyond the cherry-trees o'er the dim lagoon*
> *Dawns the crimson lantern of the large low moon.*
>
> "We that loved in April, we that turned away
> Laughing, ere the wood-dove crooned across the May,
> Watch the withered rose-leaves drift along the shore,
> Wind among the roses, blow no more. . . .
>
> "Lonely starry faces, wonderful and white,
> Yearning with a cry across the dim sweet night,
> All our dreams are blown adrift as flowers before a fan,
> All our hearts are haunted in the heart of old Japan."

These, again, out of "Pirates":

> "Come to me, you with the laughing face, in the night as I lie
> Dreaming of days that are dead and of joys gone by;
> Come to me, comrade, come through the slow-dropping rain,
> Come from your grave in the darkness and let us be playmates again."

And once more this opening to the magnificent ballad of "Silk o' the Kine," to which I cannot pretend to do justice in so brief a quotation:

> "Heather-drowsy, heather-drowsy, lapped in the sunlight together
> Eilidh and Isla lay one day in the golden summer weather.
> For the silken sea of her golden hair and its billows of shadow and shine
> Had Sonch the Singer named her Eilidh—Silk o' the Kine;
> And the laughing lovers were cradled in clouds of purple and gold,
> As round their couch in the heather it rippled and glistened and rolled.
> And the honey-sweet air was wild with the warble of birds and the whisper of rills;
> And the wind blew soft and sweet with the scent of the bloom of a thousand hills;
> And a myriad twinkling smiles awoke in the dreamy blue of the bay,
> For, far and far above them, Eilidh and Isla lay;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And her hand lay warm in his clasping hand; two young lovers were they;
Two young lovers were they."

One of the most striking and original poems in the book is called "Earth-Bound," and tells of two dead lovers who are tired of heaven and the infinite and long for their little earthly home again. Here are a few lines:

"We two, love, we should come
Seeking a little refuge from the light
Of the blinding, terrible star-sown Infinite,
Seeking some sheltering roof, some four-walled home.
. . . . . .
"So we should wander nigh
Our mortal home, and see its little roof
Keeping the deep eternal night aloof,
And yielding us a refuge from the sky.
"We should steal in, once more,
Under the cloudy lilac at the gate,
Up the walled garden, then with hearts elate
Forget the stars and close our cottage door."

When such poetry is being written, is it not rather stupid to say, like those old ladies, that there are no poets nowadays?

RICHARD LE GALLIENNE.

THE AMERICAN CHARACTER.*

THESE books have, on the surface, at least, so much in common as to make it natural to take them up together. They deal alike with questions of American political and civic character. All of Mr. Wendell's chapters, and most of Mr. Lodge's, were originally delivered from the public platform. But the resemblance cannot really be carried very far, since one of the writers is a politician of a "practical" type, and the other an academic theorist. Some interesting comparisons, however, are suggested by these very differences in point and method of attack.

Mr. Wendell's addresses come to us by way of the Sorbonne and the Lowell Institute. Necessarily, we must expect from such a series of popular lectures not so much a fresh enunciation as a characteristic one. An effective public appearance of that sort

* "Liberty, Union and Democracy: The National Ideals of America." By Barrett Wendell. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
"A Frontier Town, and Other Essays." By Henry Cabot Lodge. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

depends largely upon the abandon with which one trots out one's hobby-horses. Some of the members of Mr. Wendell's stud, which are here exhibited, we recall having encountered in the pages of his "Literary History of America," and in his more recent series of "Essays Concerning America." The most important of them is the theory of "the national character of America," here developed at length in his initial lecture. His contention is, in brief, that the distinctive American national character appears in the very earliest colonial settlers. Accepting Lincoln as a supreme type of Americanism, we are to trace his lineage, not only to Washington and Franklin, but to the Mathers and John Cotton. In John Cotton and the other pre-Revolutionary Englishmen who first came to America, Mr. Wendell discerns more than a germ of the character which is now distinctively American. By "pre-Revolutionary" Englishmen he means those Englishmen who reached maturity before the accession of Charles First. This type did not survive in England the stress and disillusioning of the years which followed. But it translated to America the ideals and noble enthusiasms which always obtain during the years preceding a revolution. Says Mr. Wendell:

> "A pre-Revolutionary epoch must be an epoch of noble dreams. . . . The awakening from such dreams in European experience is among the saddest facts which recurrently pervade European history. Just that kind of sad experience was one of the few trials which our American forefathers were in great measure spared; for they were pre-Revolutionary Englishmen who founded our own country in pre-Revolutionary times."

This is to say that the post-Revolutionary Englishman became John Bull, a practical, lethargic and dreamless person, while the American provincial remained, so far as he was English at all, a pre-Revolutionary Englishman, who, when presently it devolved upon him to offset the old England against the new, became Brother Jonathan. The origin of the American national character, therefore, "can be traced to instinctive idealism of pre-Revolutionary England, strengthened and refined by the intensely orderly idealism ingrained in those who faithfully accepted the Calvinistic creed. Such were the forefathers of modern America."

In his "Literary History," Mr. Wendell notes a "pristine alertness of mind" as the striking characteristic of the Eliza-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bethans. Whatever of this quality our Colonial forefathers brought with them from pre-Revolutionary England, was exercised solely in the pursuit of religious and material ends. But Mr. Wendell believes that then, as now, the American spirit of idealism underlay this manifestation of material activity. He is extraordinarily sanguine as to the present fact, quoting at length the testimony of "a shrewd French man of business" to the effect that the European pursues wealth as an end, while the American regards it only as a means. Some American man of business might be found shrewd enough, polite enough, or, better, honest enough, to reverse the compliment; the opinion of the civilized world would hardly accuse him of flattery. Mr. Wendell is evidently sincere in believing that "the typical American man of affairs" is "the most beneficent patron of ideal ends and purposes who has yet shown himself upon this planet." And what proves this? Nothing more or less than the large amount of money given by our rich men to public institutions. We have no knowledge of the statistics, but we have been given to suppose that rich men in several European countries do similar things. At all events, history would seem to indicate that putting your penny in the plate does not show it to have been honestly got. It is a pleasant thing for all of us that the American business man lets fall some of the pennies he cannot spend—or rather counts them out with scrupulous care—into the public palm; but it says nothing of his idealism, nothing whatever.

The detail is a minor one, but it will serve as well as another to suggest the weakness of Mr. Wendell's expository method. Having evolved a brilliant theory (and this of the survival, and more or less belated expression, in America of impulses born in England is the theory for which he is best known), he bends all facts to fit it. He is intent upon proving that the "instinctive idealism of pre-Revolutionary England," its "pristine alertness of mind," vanished in England with Cromwell, but continued to exist in America. Hence it appears to him that Lord Herbert of Cherbury is "marked by a big, youthful spontaneity," while Samuel Pepys, a diarist of the Restoration, is "an old-fashioned man rather than a man of the earlier type." What qualities has Pepys more striking than his alertness, youthfulness and spontaneity? Who of later generation would have been more at home at the Mermaid?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In his lecture on Democracy, Mr. Wendell has occasion to describe a man in public life who was doubtfully regarded by the public:

> "To be sure, even his enemies admitted that he was honest: he did not fill his pockets with public moneys. For years, however, he had devoted himself to the task of placing and maintaining in public office a great number of persons whose only qualification seemed to be unswerving devotion to the political party of which his considerable talent for organization had made him the local leader. Accordingly, all reformers agreed in calling him unscrupulous."

One could hardly choose more accurate terms to describe the general attitude, in Massachusetts, at least, toward Senator Lodge.

No public man of his generation has been more harshly criticised by friends, or more ruthlessly blackguarded by enemies. We do not precisely regard him as a martyr; he has made his bed deliberately, and seems content to lie in it. The public grievance against him is not that he has no ideal, but that his ideal is a false one. We in Massachusetts are forever hurling the memory of Senator Hoar at him. We tell him that, with exceptional powers and opportunities, he has made of himself not an eminent statesman, but a prominent "practical" politician. He does not seem to mind being told these things. Mr. Wendell's local boss probably did not; for he had his own notions of political responsibility. He believed, first, that men should work for a party; and, second, that the best workers should be rewarded. Perhaps this is not immeasurably remote from Senator Lodge's political creed. An ordinary citizen may look into the printed record of such a man's opinions with an inquiring, even inquisitive, eye. What does he believe, anyhow, and what is he aiming at? In these varied addresses there is every reason to expect that his political creed will be expressed rather to its advantage.

To our surprise we find Mr. Lodge at his clumsiest in speaking of the matters which concern him, or our interest in him, most —matters to the discussion of which one would think all his powers might have assembled. The paper on good citizenship (originally, by a chance not lacking in irony, published in "Success") is but a lame affair.

One is lulled by the vagueness of the talk about the attitude

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the citizen, and amazed by the ingenuousness of the directions for specific action:

"What is most needed is to follow the course of public affairs closely, to understand what is being done, and what the various candidates represent; and then, when the time for the vote in the caucus or at the polls arrives, a citizen interested only in good government, or in the promotion of a given policy, knows what he wants and can act intelligently."

First aid to the imbecile: think only sensible thoughts, and speak to the point! But we are not long left so helplessly adrift as this; the ardent citizen is not without a guide:

"If he follows public affairs from day to day, and, thus informed, *acts with his friends and those who think as he does* at the caucus and the polls, he will make his influence fully felt, and will meet completely the test of good citizenship."

The words I have italicized embody the only "practical" rule in the suggested code; "the rest is leather and prunella." One cannot doubt that Senator Lodge is an honest man; yet one cannot ignore the fact that much of his work has been of a sort incompatible with high ideals. When he speaks of public service, he means party service; and when he speaks of ambition, he means desire of personal advancement. In his addresses on Senator Hoar and his sketch of President Roosevelt he is at his best, always fluent and reasonable, and not seldom forcible and just. We may not attempt to discuss these papers here, or their companion addresses on historical themes. It must suffice us to quote without comment Mr. Lodge's statement of his conception of the American character:

"We of the United States like to think of the typical American as a brave and honest man, very human, and with no vain pretence to infallibility. We would have him simple in his home life, democratic in his ways, with the highest education which the world can give, kind to the weak, tender and loyal and true, never quarrelsome but never afraid to fight, with a strong, sane sense of humor, and with a strain of adventure in the blood, which we shall never cease to love until those ancestors of ours who conquered a continent have drifted a good deal farther into the past than is the case to-day. These are the qualities which all men admire and respect, and which, thus combined, we like to think peculiarly American. As I enumerate them, I describe Theodore Roosevelt."

H. W. BOYNTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"JOSEPH VANCE."*

THAT a contemporary of Mr. Meredith and Mr. James should have been so far able to resist the influences of his time as to produce a novel that is mid-Victorian to the least syllable may seem at first sight a startling case of artistic obduracy. Yet it is possible that the elaborate simplicity of "Joseph Vance" is the disguise of a shrewd artfulness, and that it was Mr. de Morgan's sophisticated intention to imply a comment on literary fashions with which he may not happen to be in sympathy. Or the novel's period of incubation may have been unnaturally prolonged, and it may literally be a lonely survival of the age of Dickens and Thackeray, discipleship to both of which masters it frankly displays. That the question of a novel's origin can be seriously considered indicates, at all events, a book of more than usual substance. "Joseph Vance" scarcely offers the point of departure for a robust enthusiasm, but it has a pleasant genuineness, and the story is told with accomplished skill. So far as a thing of paper may, it has personality. One finds oneself comparing this "ill-written autobiography," as the title-page proclaims it, with novels of recognized importance, rather than with the ill-considered companions of its hour of publication.

What are understood to be cogent commercial reasons seem nowadays to force the "successful" novelist, even in the event of having something interesting to tell, to tell it briskly, that his page may invite the restless reader, and meagrely, that there may be left over a thrifty remnant for next year's book. There is almost a disproportionate refreshment, therefore, in the unhurried amplitude of this pleasantly old-fashioned novel. "Joseph Vance" has not only broad plan and lavish detail, but a certain organic luxuriance which perhaps no soundly good novel will ever be found to lack. A reader with a proper sense of his own privileges wishes to have the illusion that for the time his author has spent himself; that an entire history is being offered him, without suppression. To all tricky short-cuts, treacherous eliminations, Mr. de Morgan is conservatively superior. It would be impossible to put too strongly the extent to which his book would have suffered if its author had felt, for instance, that he had not time to explain how Christopher Vance, Joseph's father,

* "Joseph Vance." By William de Morgan. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

came to adopt the trade of "Builder. Repairs. Drains promptly attended to." The quotation is from a certain sign-board, whose effect "on the passing spectator," Joe's mother asserted in proud capitals, was "Electrical." The episode is so richly complete that a paraphrase would be brutal. And—astonishingly, perhaps—the fact that it is written in the Dickens manner seems quite to be an accident and in no way lessens its originality.

Christopher Vance, indeed, is the very heart of the book. He is conceived in the spirit of pure humor, and there is almost a rapture in noting his perfect consistency. Long-suffering readers, too well schooled in the magical reforms that Fiction inflicts upon its characters, may very naturally fear lest this entertaining and unworthy person give up whiskey or remain faithful to his wife's memory or suffer repentance for the illegitimate basis of his business. It is only fair to the author to say that no such distressing issue is introduced. Mr. Vance marries the housemaid, Seraphina Dowdeswell, familiarly known as "Feener," and more or less literally drinks himself to death.

A book written in this temper has, by some mysterious law, to have a sentimental hero; and, even more obviously, a sentimental heroine. It is quite easy to see Joseph Vance, in the colored print of his period, leaning against some ill-defined piece of furniture in an attitude suggesting genteel romance tempered with melancholy. It is not so easy to imagine him in flesh and blood, devoting his life to a gentle passion, its cult clouded and saddened by those Misunderstandings which, as we all know, the exigencies of Plot impose. The first disappointment is that Joseph should have failed to inherit his illiterate father's piquancy and sense of humor. He is, however, lovable, which results in his becoming the protégé of Lossie Thorpe, and precocious, which induces Lossie's father to educate him. Joseph was very brilliant at college; perhaps it is a magnificent stroke of literalness that he should not have amounted to much later on. However, this story is concerned, not with Joseph's ambitions, if he had any, but with his romantic history.

As for this aspect of the novel, the most surprising thing is that it should have been regarded as a romantic history at all. For consider its outline. Joseph does not know he is in love with Lossie—she is some years older than he—until he learns, while at Oxford, that she is engaged to a famous soldier. From this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pale sorrow he never recovers—a tiresome and ungrateful part for a hero to play, even more so in that his own later marriage is ingeniously reconciled with this earlier and unsurrendered devotion. The second young woman, who is more good than beautiful, is obliged to bear the name of Jane and to woo Joseph through two engagements. She is drowned on the honeymoon. For many years afterward Joseph leads a distressingly forlorn life, comforting himself with a rarefied spiritualism and allowing Lossie, by the contrivances of a very old-fashioned plot, to believe him the father of her own brother's illegitimate son. The last few pages clear things up and promise a belated happiness for Joseph and Lossie.

It will have to be admitted that this is a tepid history, and that if the novel contained nothing else there might, after all, be very little to say about the autobiography of Joseph Vance. But there is such generosity of incident, such an engaging variety of digression, that the reader finds himself able to pass cheerfully over the separation, estrangement and other emotional disasters of Joe and Lossie, knowing that they are both too good to be true; that no such people ever existed. There is always the chance, he remembers, that Christopher or Feener may appear on the next page; and he is likewise at liberty to count on the infrequent but solacing appearances of Porky Owls or Peter Gunn. There would also have been an interesting blackguard in Beppino, Lossie's brother, had not the author himself regarded this unscrupulous young person with excessive animus. Beppino seems like a stern exposure of somebody the novelist has known and disapproved of. The "better moments" which we are sure he must have had are relentlessly suppressed, and we are almost inclined to resent for him the blackness of the descriptive dye. And, above all, if the reader finds himself forgetting the stilted history of the impeccable Joseph, there will nevertheless have abided with him a certain rare and excellent flavor which the book's sentimentalities and banalities do not impair—a flavor not wholly humorous, although it is the humor of the book upon which one would insist, but tinged also with the essence of wisdom. He will remember, too, some of the many unpretentiously good bits of picture-making, like this sentence about Fiesole:

"But as I look at the white wafer behind the curling fog-reek that I know is the sun in the country, I think of the *sole di marzo* blazing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the roses in that Tuscan heat-trap; of the rifted trunks and dark leaves and light leaves of the olives; of the mighty deliberation of the great white oxen that no man can make to go quicker or stop; of the scraps of song that all end in one cadence and make one feel how very much one really is in Tuscany."

Novel-readers, however, must bear in mind that Mr. de Morgan's in many respects remarkable book will give them none of the elements to which they are latterly accustomed — neither romance, as they will understand it, nor "adventure," nor "psychology." The author's reticence as to anything beneath the externals of his characters suggests a singular and overscrupulous delicacy. He would, one may believe, consider it ungentlemanly to pry behind the screen which his heroine (if he had one) would set before her emotion (if she had any). "Joseph Vance" is probably the only book of its kind that the present generation will offer; therefore the most may as well be made of the temperate, mellow, elderly enjoyment it affords.

OLIVIA HOWARD DUNBAR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: PARIS.

LONDON, *November, 1906.*

BOOKS and soap have been the preoccupation of England during the past month; books, because of the fight between "The Times" and the publishers, and soap, because of the combine formed by its leading manufacturers.

As a bait to subscribers, "The Times" started last year a Book Club. It wished to increase its circulation and its revenue from advertisements, both of them matters of some difficulty for a six-cent paper competing with two-cent and one-cent rivals. But, by throwing in a circulating library with the journal, as a grocer throws in a lithograph with his pound of tea, "The Times" justly counted on a large extension of its clientele. You pay a year's subscription to "The Times"—something just under twenty dollars—and without any extra expense you become at once entitled to all the privileges of the Book Club. Those privileges are very great. "The Times" has made its Book Club incomparably the best organization of the kind that has ever been seen in England. Take my own experience. I am entitled to get from the Book Club three books a week. They are delivered at my house regularly every Thursday, and the carrier takes away with him the supply of the previous week. The books are as clean and fresh-looking as though they had just come from the publishers. I have never yet been kept waiting for a book. Those who were subscribers to the journal found themselves, without paying out a single penny, members of the most generous, up-to-date and competent Book Club in the world. Those who were not subscribers hastened to become so. To the number of ninety thousand they rushed in; the Book Club nearly burst its premises on Bond Street; a huge emporium had to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opened on Oxford Street; the book trade underwent a sudden revival; and for a while authors, publishers, "The Times" and the subscribers were equally jubilant.

But lending books was only one of the functions of the Book Club; it was far more important to its interests to sell them. Only so could it hope to become in any sense a self-supporting institution. A few years ago there was a crisis in the English bookselling trade. The discount system had practically killed it, and booksellers were taking to stocking tobacco and photograph-frames and so on. A remedy was found in the Net-book Agreement of 1899. By it the booksellers agreed not to sell net books below the published price, and the publishers agreed to refuse to supply books to any bookseller infringing this rule. "The Times" Book Club notified its adhesion to this agreement, and in the letter, at any rate, it has observed it. That is to say, it has sold no new net book below the published price. But, in a library, a book ceases to be new after it has once passed into circulation. A book that has gone through two subscribers' hands in the first week of its existence may be as good as new, but as a matter of fact it is not new. No bookseller would accept it if it were offered to him as a new copy by a publisher. Yet, for the purposes of the ordinary reading man, its condition and appearance may be perfectly satisfactory. "The Times" Book Club saw the value of the distinction between absolutely new and new enough. You cannot go into the Book Club and buy an absolutely new net book below the published price. But you can buy copies that have only been in circulation a week, a fortnight or one or two months at very considerable discounts. The ordinary booksellers at once began to clamor for protection. They brought pressure to bear on the publishers, who, having to choose between their largest customer and a multitude of smaller ones, sought safety in numbers and yielded to the clamor. The Net-book Agreement of 1899 was so amended as to prohibit the sale of a net book below published price within six months of publication. "The Times" declined to accept the amendment. The publishers retaliated by withdrawing all their advertisements from "The Times" and by refusing to allow the Book Club trade terms.

And there the quarrel hangs, with both sides appealing to the public for sympathy and support. An infinity of branch issues

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has sprung from it, and the public explores them all with palpable relish. Do publishers make exorbitant profits? Will "The Times," if it is allowed a free hand, end by ruining itself or the booksellers? Are booksellers a necessity, anyway? Why should the Book Club, which is not a genuine library or a genuine bookseller, but has merely entered those walks in order to double the circulation of "The Times," be permitted to undersell and destroy the legitimate bookseller, who has no other means of making a living, and whose business is his sole source of income? And then, of course, the fiscal aspects of the question receive notice. Are the publishers fighting for what is in effect a close monopolistic ring, while "The Times" champions the cause of free trade in books? Or is it the other way about? Or doesn't the question possess a fiscal aspect? Both sides, I need hardly say, fling at each other's head the charge of being a Trust—"The Times" for the distribution, and the publishers for the production, of books. Problems of enormous intricacy arise as the discussion proceeds. Are books too dear? On which side of the dispute do the interests of authors lie? From the standpoint of literature, is it better that "The Times" should win or lose? But you may imagine the endless offshoots of such a controversy, and the more readily as the great fight between the publishers and the department stores in America covered very much the same ground. I think that opinion generally is on the side of "The Times." The subscribers to the Book Club are firmly supporting it, and are heroically refusing to ask for the books that bear the imprint of publishers who have been foremost in the attack. Neither side as yet shows any sign of yielding. But I think that, before the Christmas trade grows brisk, a compromise of some sort will be reached. An agreement that no net book shall be sold below the published price within, say, two or three months of publication seems the obvious and equitable arrangement.

As for the other matter which has agitated opinion here during the last few weeks—the formation of the so-called Soap Trust—I doubt whether any incident could have illuminated more clearly certain peculiarities of the British character and of British economics. Certain soap-making firms, with a capital of about $60,000,000, have entered into a combination in order to get rid of the needless waste of unfettered competition. To call this combination a Trust seems to me a misnomer. It includes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most but by no means all of British manufacturers; there are enough firms left outside to put up a stern fight, if any fighting is found necessary. Nor does the Soap Trust aim at controlling the ingredients used in the manufacture of soap. An attempt to "corner" oils, tallow and the other alkaline bodies would be even more hopeless than an attempt to "corner" wheat. Nor, while it may amalgamate many interests, is there, so far as I can see, any chance of its being able to monopolize the distribution of the completed article. Free Trade is a mighty bulwark against extortion, and to form a Trust that would really dominate the English market it would be necessary, not only to combine the majority of English manufacturers, but also to control their American and Continental rivals, as well as the main sources of production. This is not, of course, physically impossible; but it is an enterprise of such appalling difficulty, and success in it is a matter of such extreme hazard, that it is hardly worth undertaking. The English public, once aroused, is quick to act and to defend itself. The Soap Trust began by attempting to sell a fifteen-ounce bar of soap for the same price as a sixteen-ounce bar. There was such an instantaneous roar of indignation, such a gathering in arms of all the retail grocers throughout the kingdom, such an immediate and persistent boycott of all the Trust's soaps, that the manœuvre was not only checked and exposed, but was officially disavowed.

The news of Sir Mortimer Durand's retirement, not merely from the British Embassy at Washington, but from the diplomatic service, was expected by very few people. It has left the general public surprised and puzzled. There being no reason on the surface to account for the resignation of an Ambassador who is still only in his fifty-sixth year, people have been inclined to ascribe it to some political disagreement, hitherto unrevealed. The "Morning Post," for instance, hinted that Sir Mortimer preferred throwing up his office to putting his signature to any treaty or compact framed along the lines of the Newfoundland *modus vivendi*. I do not know how that may be, but to any one who is aware of the strength of Sir Mortimer's Imperialism the supposition is not unreasonable. It is possible, also, that opinion in Downing Street has been somewhat poisoned against Sir Mortimer. The solid worth of the man, his deep acquaintance with American history and politics, his insight into the American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

character, and his unfailing coolness, competency and dignity when confronted by serious business may have carried less weight with some people—for instance, with British tourists, Parliamentary and otherwise—than a certain stiffness and reserve in his social deportment.

Politics since I last wrote have shifted their centre of gravity from the House of Commons to the House of Lords. Their lordships have been considering the Education Bill to some purpose. It was never very lucid; they have made it chaotic. It insured the supremacy of popular control over national education; they have reestablished in its most aggressive form the tyranny of denominationalism. By amendment after amendment they have vitiated the principles and destroyed the purpose of Mr. Birrell's Bill, and have sought to reimpose upon the country a system even more favorable to the Established Church than was the Education Act of 1902. Of course, the Lords' amendments will not be accepted. Speaking officially on November 13th, as the Minister in charge of the Bill, Mr. Birrell declared that "a Liberal Government had no use for such a measure" as the Lords are piecing together. That unquestionably is so, and unless the Lords agree under pressure to abandon all the important amendments they have incorporated into the Government's Bill, a conflict between the two Houses, that may not end until it has strained the British Constitution, will have been begun. That the Lords are bracing themselves to reject compromise may be gathered from the action of the Conservative party in allowing the Trades Disputes Bill to pass its third reading in the House of Commons without a division. The meaning of that is that the Conservatives feel they cannot simultaneously engage both the Labor party and the Nonconformists. The Lords will probably follow Mr. Balfour's example, allow the Trades Disputes Bill to pass almost unaltered, and, having thus conciliated Labor, will feel free to throw their whole strength into the Education fight. I dare not prophesy what the result will be; but I am persuaded that, unless the Lords climb down, the complete secularization of English education may be much nearer than is thought. Mr. Birrell's Bill gives the Church of England the last chance it is likely to have. To reject it, or to refuse to withdraw the amendments that have, as a matter of fact, devitalized it, is to invite a very summary retribution.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PARIS, *November, 1906.*

I AM not quite sure that the endless talk about the separation of Church and State is very exciting for foreigners. But to the Frenchman, nothing exceeds the interest of the Religious War.

During the three weeks which preceded the publication of the Pope's encyclical, France was held breathless by two enigmas of apparently equal magnitude: Will the Pope give in, or will he resist? Is Joseph Delarue lying murdered at the bottom of some stone-pit, or has he eloped with the schoolmistress? When the Pope had "spoken," as the phrase went, and the newspaper readers had recovered from their surprise, the other question arose: "What will Clémenceau do now?"

It is notable that the Pope's decision is not political, but dogmatic. This ought to be clearly understood by anybody who wishes to take a correct view of the state of affairs. As I explained in a previous letter, the main object of the Separation Law was to substitute Associations of lay people for individual ecclesiastics in the necessary intercourse between the State and the Church. These Associations, according to Article IV of the Law, were to be in keeping with the general rules of the Church, that is to say, were to be dependent on, and not rebellious against, the Bishops. But Article VIII says that, in case of conflict between two Associations, the decision shall be left to the Council of State. This is the point to which the Pope objects.

I have not the least doubt that monastic and monarchist influences of a mischievous tendency were brought to bear on the Pope's judgment. It seems plain to me that the Council of State was bound by Article IV to refer to the Bishops in cases of difficulties, and consequently there was no danger of partial schisms from episcopal authority. But the Pope was almost certainly actuated by a distrust for which, not the present Government, but M. Combes, is responsible. The reader must remember how the Association Law passed in 1901 by M. Waldeck-Rousseau—to be, as he said, a Charter for the authorized religious Orders—was turned against them by the Combes Cabinet, and resulted in the general expulsion of all Orders and the confiscation of their property. The Pope dreaded some such abuse of a legal text, and his diffidence exaggerated for him the danger of civic interference in matters ecclesiastical. The position of Pius X is pretty clear. He merely declines to avail himself of a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

law which, on the whole, is advantageous to the Church, until he is satisfied by an official statement of the French Parliament that there is no snare hidden under Article VIII of the Law.

One may regret this attitude. Certainly, the majority of the French Bishops must have regretted it, considering their vote in favor of a totally different one. By holding thus aloof, the Pope prevents the legal transference of the Church property, thus far in the hands of the Vestry Boards (over $50,000,000), and renders doubtful even the right of priests to retain their churches; he practically starves the French clergy, and, to a certain extent, endangers the Church of France. It is sacrificing much to a principle which perhaps is not in jeopardy. But if this course can be regretted, there is no reason for calling it, as the violent anti-clerical press does, "a rebellion," or, in the words of an English Catholic, in a well-known magazine, "a Papal aggression on France." There is no more obligation upon the Pope to take advantage of this law than there is for a French citizen to submit to the regulations concerning matrimony. One is a loser by dispensing with the presence of the registrar, but one is not a rebel.

Although the Pope seeks only to maintain what he regards as a prerogative of the Church, to decide in matters which concern nobody but herself, his action could not but have political consequences. The reactionary party, voiced by such papers as the "*Gaulois*," the "*Soleil*," the "*Croix*," etc., immediately enlarged on the embarrassments in which the Pope's interference was placing the French Government. In their opinion, this quiet "Nay" was the greatest victory achieved by the Papacy in the last forty years. The Government would be sure to seek its revenge in measures hurtful to itself—it would close the churches, and the populace, no matter how vaguely religious, would rise to reopen them; this revolution would probably lead to a Restoration, and the Edenic state of affairs prophesied by the monarchists would be inaugurated without any call on the royalist energies. On the other hand, the "*Lanterne*," and the radical press generally, contended that M. Clémenceau should not stop short of the most stringent measures, but ought to shut the churches as soon as the Law enabled him to do so, and turn the Bishops out of the country, as supporters and agents of a foreign monarch.

M. Clémenceau at once gave proofs of his usual presence of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mind. He affected to treat the matter very lightly, declared to as many journalists as chose to interview him that, in spite of the monarchists' hopes and efforts, not one church would be closed under his administration, and went away to Carlsbad in perfect serenity. Meanwhile, the moderate press, like the "*Figaro*," the "*Débats*" and the "*Temps*," were trying to devise schemes for satisfying the Pope without enraging the Chamber. Various plans had been proposed, when Pius X suddenly discouraged everybody by telling a reporter of the "*Gaulois*"—a mistake which proves his lack of acquaintance with the political parties in France—that he would accept no guarantee except from the Chamber itself. This put an end to the matter, and to wait became really the only course. There was not long to wait. The new Cabinet had hardly been formed, and it was still discussing its announcement to the country, when a solution was arrived at. The Law contained a clause to the effect that, should no Associations turn up to claim the Church property, this property would remain in abeyance for a year, after which it would be appropriated by the State or by Municipal Charities. This proviso offered the Cabinet an easy method of postponing a difficult solution. M. Briand and M. Clémenceau have decided that, until December 11th, 1907, things will remain *in statu quo*, the revenue of the Church property being employed *pro tem.* for the repairs of ecclesiastical buildings.

No minister, since the eventful days of Boulanger, has been so interesting, so amusing, so full of unexpected resources, so ready to play practical jokes on the public, so polite and disdainful as Clémenceau. I have said above how calmly he dealt with the first difficulties arising from the Pope's encyclical, but his conduct on that perplexing occasion was nothing to the brilliancy he displayed when intrusted with the formation of a Cabinet. He took it all so much as a matter of course. Nobody had ever been quite aware that honest M. Sarrien was First Minister, and the poor gentleman slipped out of office as quietly as he had entered it. As to M. Clémenceau, everybody, on the contrary, had looked upon him as the real Premier, and it was the most natural thing in the world to see him hustling about in quest of Ministers suitable to him. The practical difficulty was to find out a Foreign Minister, a Minister of Finance and a Minister of War, who would be agreeable to the Socialists—without

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whose sixty or eighty votes no Cabinet can stand—and yet who would be flexible in the hands of the Master. M. Clémenceau began with a masterly stroke, which instantly won him the support of Jaurès. There had never been in this land of democracy anything like a Department of Labor. One was promptly produced, and M. Viviani, a distinguished Socialist of great promise, was nominated to it. There was some little trouble about the assignment of the Foreign Office. Every one knows M. Clémenceau's Anglophil tendency, the blunt common phrase being that "Clémenceau is sold to the English." Now, there is no doubt that the *entente cordiale* is becoming only slowly, though steadily, popular. The Socialist party lean evidently to the German side (Jaurès's paper was refloated three weeks ago by German assistance), and they would object to any too marked advance made to England. Yet M. Clémenceau wanted M. Pischon, a bosom friend of his, to whom the German press immediately took exception. It took M. Clémenceau two days—during which his communications to the journalists beat the best farce ever acted—to demonstrate to the country that his *protégé* was just the right man in the right place. All this time, he was promising his journalistic hearers "a surprise." The surprise was the appointment of General Picquart to the War Office, and this surprise was so stunning that, made as it was in the teeth of public opinion, the nomination elicited next to no comment. Finally, our finance was entrusted to M. Caillaux. M. Clémenceau would have been lucky if he could have retained M. Poincaré in that difficult post. I showed in my last letter how this very able and straightforward financier had owned to a deficit of nearly two hundred millions of francs, and what means he had suggested for balancing the Budget. Certainly the country did not like the prospect of fresh taxes, but the honesty and the evident capacity of the Minister gave courage to the timid; if the Exchequer was low, at least its condition and the means of improving it were clear. The Bourse undoubtedly trusted M. Poincaré. It would appear that this gentleman's prejudice in favor of plain statements and methods was not shared by his immediate fellow workers. When M. Clémenceau came to ask the continuation of his assistance, M. Poincaré not only refused it, but made public his reasons for doing so. The letter was clear and uninvolved, like everything which comes from the same

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hand. It left no doubt that the Budget Committee, without whose concurrence a Minister of Finance is powerless, had no intention of supporting M. Poincaré in his work of restoration, but, on the contrary, favored methods closely akin to garbling and deceiving, which could avail only to blind those who were not aware of the real state of affairs.

The present situation may be summed up as follows:

M. Clémenceau appears more and more as a wonderfully clear-headed, strong-handed politician—one might say statesman, if there were not something histrionic and a *brusquerie* bespeaking caprice in his manner. He is almost nearer to a dictator than to a Premier, a great novelty in this country. Very few people like him, but many admire him, and he possesses undoubted magnetism. The programme he submitted to the Chamber on November 5th is reasonable and distinctly socialistic, giving special attention to Labor questions, the buying back of a railway, an old-age pension and an income tax, the suppression of courts-martial and various military reforms, and the suppression of capital punishment. This programme will be supported by the Socialists as well as the Radicals, and, excepting one item, cannot meet with much opposition. The danger for the Cabinet then must lie in the possibility of some unexpected freak of the Premier's and still more in the presence of M. Caillaux in the Cabinet. The latter gentleman has a wonderful gift of lending lucidity, interest and even charm to the most abstruse financial technicalities, but he is an artist in Budgets, not a matter-of-fact business man. It is an ominous fact that, in less than a week after his appointment and the statement that his Income-Tax Bill might affect the *rentes,* these securities lost two points. There is apparent political stability, but the fortune of France is, on the contrary, more unstable than it has ever been, and M. Clémenceau may turn out to be only an extraordinary builder of card houses.

Let me note, before concluding this communication, that a violent campaign is being carried on against the American Insurance Companies, by means of arguments which are likely to bring the rest of American securities into discredit. The exodus of French capital, which I noticed in my last letter, is evidently responsible for this.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

MONDAY, *November 26.* **Races Cannot Mingle.**

As we anticipated at the inception of the difficulty, a simple deadlock between National and municipal authorities has been the net result of Japan's protest against the exclusion of her children from the public schools of San Francisco. Secretary Metcalf's efforts on behalf of the Administration to induce the School Board to reconsider its determination have been unavailing, and it now seems likely that some force other than moral suasion will be required to make the local regulation conform to Japan's interpretation of the existing treaty. That the Mikado's Government considers the exclusion to be a violation of that agreement there can be no question; otherwise it would not have taken so serious a step in making formal remonstrance, which, if unheeded, would naturally be followed by a positive demand, which, in turn, must be granted or refused. Clearly, Japan regards this as a suitable time, and is willing, to make open issue, because, if her Government had wished merely to solve the problem without friction, it would have exercised in the first instance a quieter form of diplomacy. The technical situation, therefore, possesses poignant interest. The State Department has not disclosed the precise grounds upon which the protest was based; but we may safely assume from unofficial Japanese utterances that they are contained in Articles 1 and 14 of the treaty concluded in 1894. The latter states that:

. . . "**The high contracting parties agree that in all that concerns commerce and navigation, any privilege, favor or immunity which either high contracting party has actually granted or may hereafter grant to the Government, ships, citizens or subjects of any other State shall be extended to the Government, ships, citizens or subjects of the other high contracting party, gratuitously, if the concession in favor of that other State shall have been gratuitous, and on the same or equivalent condi-**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions if the concession shall have been conditional; it being their intention that the trade and navigation of each country shall be placed, in all respects, by the other upon the footing of the most favored nation."

Mr. Tomesaburo Shimizu, one of Japan's numerous unofficial spokesmen residing in this country, places particular stress upon this paragraph and discourses at some length upon the dishonor involved in violating the *spirit* of a contract. We find no justification for his position. Indeed, the equal privileges guaranteed are so carefully restricted to "all that concerns commerce and navigation" that it might fairly be argued that it was the deliberate intent of the contracting parties to exclude all others from the agreement.

Article 1 is more applicable, providing, rather broadly than explicitly, that:

. . . "The citizens or subjects of each contracting party shall enjoy in the territories of the other the same privileges, liberties and rights, and shall be subject to no higher imposts or charges in these respects, than native citizens or subjects, or citizens or subjects of the most favored nation."

"If," declares Mr. Shimizu, "the School Board of San Francisco excluded all alien children, we might not care"—though it seems hardly a case of caring or not caring, but of actual prerogative —"but the prohibition is only for Mongolian children. Our children have the right as most favored nation, and they, of course, have the right to attend the schools with other white alien children, as well as American citizens." In other words, since Italian and British children are permitted to attend the schools, the same privilege must be accorded to the sons and daughters of Japanese. An easy solution would seem to lie in the restriction of attendance of all aliens to certain schools, but we fear that even this would not induce our prideful neighbors to cease from "caring," although we suspect they would not be seriously disturbed by our possible embroilment with other nations.

The real question is whether the action of the School Board of San Francisco constitutes an actual violation of the treaty. That Japan so construes it does not, of course, make it so; indeed, considering (1) that, as a matter of fact, there is no "exclusion" whatever, but only a segregation of schools for Mongolian children quite in line with other ordinary regulations within the recognized jurisdiction of local authorities, and (2)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that there is no explicit obligation to afford any means of education whatsoever, and (3) that, practically, we do furnish adequate and equal facilities, and (4) that no treaty ever did, or ever was supposed to, enforce personal contact and association with others upon the citizens of any nation or their children, and (5) that, even if there be a technical abridgment, it is not of liberty or rights but only of "privileges"—a word of very general meaning, never interpreted as absolutely all-embracing—of nothing more than such personal contact and association; in view, we say, of these acknowledged and pertinent facts, it seems to us that a very good case could be made for a counter-declaration that the school regulation does not constitute a violation worthy of objection by a really high contracting party.

We trust that the Administration, whose seeming tacit acceptance of the Japanese view has caused no little surprise and apprehension, will seriously consider this phase of the situation before attempting any measures savoring of coercion in dealing with the citizens of a sovereign State. Infinitely better than the adoption of such procedure would be a frank and manly avowal of practical inability, on the part of the National Administration, under our constitutional restriction, to enforce this particular provision without virtually engaging in civil war, accompanied by a proposal to modify the treaty to meet the necessities of a political condition.

Facts, even prejudices at times, must be reckoned with no less than theories, and one truth may as well be understood by our Eastern brethren first as last, namely, that, treaty or no treaty, the American people will never admit to full personal association a race, however worthy, which they regard as inherently so alien that attempt at commingling could only result in disastrous failure, to the infinite disadvantage, not only of those directly concerned, but of all others throughout the world.

TUESDAY, *November 27.* **Woman Suffrage in Colorado.**

THE first thorough analysis of the results of woman suffrage in Colorado, although to our mind far from conclusive as indicative of general effects, is illuminating in several important respects. It is made by Mr. Lawrence Lewis, a close student of political conditions in Pueblo, the second largest city in the State, and apparently a wholly unprejudiced observer. The fa-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

miliar prediction that women would not exercise the privilege is quickly and effectually disposed of by the simple fact that since 1894 they have cast never less than forty and sometimes more than forty-eight per cent. of the total number of votes polled in the entire State. To determine the character of the new political force, Mr. Lewis selected fourteen representative precincts and divided each into eight residence districts, ranging from that known as the best to the lowest containing the worst saloons and brothels. The actual registration figures, arranged for simple comparison, follow:

	Total vote.	Men.	Women.
Four best districts inhabited by the rich, well-to-do, artisans, small tradesmen, mechanics, clerks, superintendents, engineers, foremen, etc.	1707	986	721
Four remaining districts comprising common laborers, Slavs, Italians and residents of cheap lodging-houses, brothels, saloons, etc.	1222	785	437

The women voters registered from the respectable districts, therefore, exceeded those from the other half by 284 in actual number and constituted 42 per cent. of the total in their section, as contrasted with 35 per cent. in the other. The percentage of registered votes actually polled was slightly larger in the better neighborhoods, the widest difference appearing between the "best," which voted 77 per cent. of the registration against only 53 per cent. from the "lodging-house" community. This result surely has a bearing, at least, upon the stock assertion that respectable women will stay at home, and that only disreputable females under coercion will actually go to the polls.

Mr. Lewis observed little change for the better in the conduct of polling-places, although at those in the most turbulent precincts men, while continuing to "wear hats and use tobacco freely," do "possibly swear a little less," while in the best city precincts and a large majority of country precincts "the order is perfect." Bribery and corruption have been rife in all Colorado cities so long that the most enthusiastic reformers did not anticipate immediate extinction of these evils to result from enlargement of the franchise privilege, but Pueblo's latest municipal election "was regarded even by politicians as the most nearly honest election in years." Particularly encouraging was the prompt and effective manifestation of resentment against the lowest politicians who compelled prostitutes, grievously

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against their will, to appear in public and vote. One "city detective" was convicted and sent to the penitentiary at once, another now awaits trial, and a former county clerk and several of his deputies are under indictment "on equally strong evidence of having supplied the brains and purse" for the hateful work.

It is not surprising, under such conditions, that this candid observer can perceive as yet no material improvement in the public conduct of officials, *but*—

"A very noteworthy change wrought by woman suffrage has been the raising of the requirement as to moral character, judged solely by their private lives, of men elected, especially to offices in our cities. Since the extension of the franchise to women, political parties have learned the inadvisability of nominating for public offices drunkards, notorious libertines, gamblers, liquor-dealers and men who engage in similar discredited occupations, *because the women almost always vote them down.*"

Of the capacity of women themselves as public officials no basis of judgment appears, since they have aspired to no control other than that of the schools, which they have practically held for years. Mr. Lewis testifies as follows:

"Ever since the extension of the franchise, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction has been a woman. This is the office of greatest importance ever held in Colorado by our new voters. Be it said further to the credit of the successive incumbents of this responsible position that theirs has been about the only one of Colorado's administrative departments, from chief executive down, the conduct of which in the past decade has always been above suspicion of rank favoritism, fraud or graft. Since 1894 the office of County Superintendent of Schools has been held continuously in a number of counties by women. Their service, generally speaking, has been so eminently correct and satisfactory that after each election the proportion of women has increased until at present they hold this office in thirty-four of the fifty-nine counties."

The conclusion of this competent observer bears out the assertion of those who rail at the non-appearance of the millennium in Colorado as an immediate effect of franchise expansion, but by rational minds, willing to accept progress in lieu of unattainable perfection, the results may fairly be considered not only encouraging, but, on the whole, satisfactory. For ourselves, we do not hesitate to pronounce them distinctly confirmatory of our original declaration of faith in the efficacy of woman suffrage, especially "in purifying the ballot and establishing and main-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taining lofty standards as to the qualifications required of candidates for public office."

WEDNESDAY, *November 28.* **The Sagacious Frivolity of Widows.**

WE have never been able to understand why even the dour Jeremiah should have regarded widowhood as a just cause of reproach. Whatever may be their sentiments after the event, few women, while their husbands live, really wish to lose them, and, barring those who cultivate the habit of nagging or whining to their own great enjoyment, practically none can be held directly responsible for the demise of her partner. It was not uncommon, however, in the old days, to consider misfortune itself as deserving of censure, and it was in this cruelly harsh spirit, we assume, that the prophet spoke.

We doubt if he would find much cause for lamentation if alive and observant to-day. Surely no reproach now attaches to widowhood, and we question whether, in point of fact, it is any longer regarded as an affliction and not, in the general run, as a somewhat happy circumstance. True, the lot of a woman, especially a young woman, suddenly deprived of the presence of the man whom she has grown accustomed to see about the house, is still regarded as one of peculiar sadness; but it is indeed amazing to note the brevity of the time required to transform commiseration into congratulation, and even envy, on the part of her sisters. The primary cause of this attitude lies doubtless in the value attached to the acquirement of pecuniary independence and personal freedom, but unless we have misjudged the controlling forces of femininity, a most unlikely supposition, the enviousness is directly traceable to a suspicion that men are prone to consider widows more attractive than maidens or even married women of similar ages. One never hears of a sour young widow, and seldom of a gay old maid; the former is referred to invariably as "captivating," the latter usually as "crabbed," and it is needless to say which a man is asked to come to meet at teas, house-parties and like functions, where the masculine presence is most desired and with the greatest difficulty obtained.

It is an interesting fact, moreover, that the discrimination in favor of the widow finds ample justification, although it is probably accounted for by the difference between what is expected of her and of her unwedded sister. No responsibility as to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attractiveness rests upon the shoulders of an unalluring spinster, and, sensitive to this depressing fact, she soon ceases to practise the arts of pleasing and relies for attention upon cultivated personal satire, which quickly palls upon one seeking a more gracious form of amusement. The young widow, on the other hand, realizing that her shining qualities have been duly heralded, is constantly alive to the necessity of justifying her reputation for vivacity, sweetness of disposition, charm of manner or daring speech, as the case may be, and is induced by pride to exert her utmost endeavors to make herself agreeable. In this she profits from the American man's chivalry to women and fidelity to men, and is aided materially by the convention of polite society, which accords her a much wider range of topics than is permitted to her unfortunate rival, whose coquetry must be veiled by seeming innocence and becoming modesty.

Not that demure appearance and coy glances lack efficacy; far from it. Even beauty, "all powerful as it is," according to Montaigne, "has not wherewithal to make itself relished without the mediation of these little arts"; if spinsters had been endowed with a monopoly of such weapons the contest would be waged more evenly. Unfortunately for them, if not indeed for all of us, these qualities are common to all women, and are so susceptible of sedulous cultivation by constant practice that the maiden's shyness of manner is fully counterbalanced by the greater adeptness of the widow in the exercise of flitting obliquity by eyelashes tinged to meet the requirements of harmonious expression.

Indefinite continuance in the intermediate state, which we have seen to be far from unhappy, would be contrary to feminine nature and distinctly unwise, as tending towards what might seem to have the effect of a professional condition, such, for example, as inevitably withers interest in a lady who has buried more than two husbands; but in the present state of our civilization, in view of the considerations herein set forth simply, yet to our mind conclusively, we unhesitatingly advise preliminary marriage with one carefully selected with a view to his early demise, to be followed by an interim of joyous widowhood before definitely and finally engaging in matrimony as a permanent vocation likely to induce the placidity of rational existence.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THURSDAY, *November 29.* **Modern Educational Methods.**

THE latest and cleverest of recent English essayists, himself the son of an archbishop and the master of a college, is distressed by the inadequacy of educational methods of the present day. Tennyson's famous indictment of Cambridge—

> "Because you do profess to teach,
> And teach us nothing, feeding not the heart,"

excites him, and he becomes the prey of melancholy. "We are," he feels and says, "too professional; we concern ourselves with methods and details; we swallow blindly the elaborate tradition under which we have ourselves been educated; we continue to respect the erudite mind, and to decry the appreciative spirit as amateurish and dilettante."

Such words from an authoritative source gratify the dreamer incapable of incorporating into concrete expression his admirable vagaries, and make pleasing reading for all, but once subjected to the test of ordinary analysis they are quickly resolved into mere evidence of "fine writing," indicative of a woful lack of comprehension. Despite the pretty phrasing, there is really no good reason for ceasing to respect the erudite mind or to decry the flabby and unwholesome "appreciative spirit," whose most recent symbol in England was the sunflower protruding offensively from the buttonhole of erotical genius. To this day, we cannot doubt, Eton exudes information if not knowledge, and paves the way for the acquirement of wisdom. Tennyson's plaint may be dismissed unresentfully as the cry of a poet; but from a competent student of human progress, such as Mr. Benson unquestionably is, we have a right to expect finer discrimination. The difficulty to which both allude lies not in the trammels of method or professionalism or regard for tradition, but in refusal or inability to differentiate in conscience between that which is good and that which is bad. The wisdom they reprobate is that of the serpent, celebrated in adage and heedlessly accepted as possessing Scriptural authority, although Solomon plainly condemned it, by inference, the Saviour in no sense endorsed it when He enjoined mere ordinary caution upon the apostles about to go forth "as sheep among wolves," and God Himself at the very beginning of creation cursed its source.

The difference between the wisdom urged upon mankind by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all divine, and indeed by any respectable human, authority, unless we accord to Niccolo Machiavelli a position not commonly conceded to him, and that disparaged by the poet and the essayist, is as wide as the gulf between praiseworthy sagacity and detestable shrewdness. The heart requires nourishment, to be sure; so does the liver; but the business of teachers is to feed and discipline the mind, having a care only not to impair the normal strengthening of the body nor to check the natural broadening of sympathies. When they bewail the restrictions imposed upon their profession by ages of experience, they indulge in talk not merely idle but distinctly harmful, tending only to induce in the youthful mind excuse for slothfulness.

Fie upon such modern philosophy! In haste we return to the ancients. *Ne sutor ultra crepidam,* and let the schoolmaster stick to his task, leaving to the hardy Saxon heart the privilege it has ever enjoyed of acquiring spirituality in proportion to its needs and its capacity.

FRIDAY, *November 30.* **Save the Children and the Nation.**

"One million seven hundred thousand children, practically uneducated, are toiling over here, and growing up, darkened, massed and dangerous, into the American future."

Such is the summary of one phase of present industrial and social conditions in this country set down in his latest book by that friendly, yet perspicacious and fearless, student and forecaster, Mr. H. G. Wells. It is, we fear, a fact as terrifying as the indictment is terrible. If the evil were segregated, demand might be made upon local pride and communal sentiment with reasonable expectation of responsive remedy; but, sad to say, this is not the case. In Massachusetts—"there she is; behold her!"—are "little naked boys packing cloth into bleaching-vats in a bath of chemicals that bleaches their little bodies like the bodies of lepers"; in the South, there are "six times as many children at work as there were twenty years ago, and each year more little ones are brought in from the fields and hills to live in the degrading atmosphere of the mill towns"; in Pennsylvania, "children of ten and eleven stoop over the chute, and pick out slate and other impurities from the coal, as it passes them, for ten or eleven hours a day"; in Illinois, they stand "ankle-deep in blood, cleaning intestines and trimming meat"; altogether,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the children between the ages of five and fourteen forced to toil in factories, mines, and slaughter-houses comprise nearly one-sixth of our entire population. Surely no cause of wonder or criticism can be found in the fact that our conservative critic finds himself impelled by duty "to note this as affecting the future; these working children cannot be learning to read—though they will presently be having votes; they cannot grow up fit to bear arms, to be, in any sense but a vile, computing sweater's sense, men; so miserably they will avenge themselves by supplying the stuff for vice, for crime, for yet more criminal and political manipulations."

To gaze upon such a picture is not pleasant; but is it not well that we be compelled by foreign judgment to behold it, that we may seek the remedy? Where, then, is the remedy to be found? Recently, in a speech made to a Young Men's Christian Association in Indiana, one of the few men in public life whose aims are creative, or at the least remedial, declared his faith in the efficacy of a method which he was about to propose. In response to an inquiry respecting it, he writes to us as follows:

"It is necessary to have a national law on this subject. It has become clear that it is quite out of the question to expect any effective cure of this evil from the States. Of course, we cannot pass any valid law prohibiting child labor in factories and mines—that is the province of the States. But we have undoubted constitutional power to pass a law providing that carriers of interstate commerce shall not transport or accept for transportation the products of factories and mines employing children under the age of fourteen years; that the interstate carrier shall require of the factory or mine owner an affidavit, in form prescribed by the Department of Commerce and Labor, that such factory or mine does not employ child labor, such affidavit to be filed every six months, etc., etc.

"Of course, this would not reach goods sent through jobbers and would not entirely correct the evil, but it will largely do so. It will affect most—I should say four-fifths—of the great factories and mines that are engaged in this indefensible practice. Above all else, it is a beginning; also, it is the only way by which we can reach this evil by a national statute."

The Senator to whom we refer—Mr. Beveridge of Indiana—adds that he will introduce a bill to this effect immediately upon the reconvening of the Congress; and for that measure he asks in advance the support of public journals and good citizens. For ourselves, we confess to a distinct dislike of the method

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proposed, as savoring of the hateful new general policy of circumventing fundamental restrictions, and exercising concentrated authority in undisguised disregard of the spirit of the Constitution; but if, in fact, no other than this evasive way should be found, and the question should resolve itself, from necessity, into a plain choice between the moral, mental and physical stultification of millions of children and a theory of government, all other considerations would weigh as a feather against the demands of common humanity.

SATURDAY, *December 1.* **Broader Aspects of Esperanto.**

THERE is no need, we feel sure, to direct the attention of our readers particularly to the truly eloquent and inspiriting address, published in this REVIEW, of Doctor Zamenhof, the inventor of Esperanto. When the official definition of the new language was under discussion at Boulogne, the proposal that the purpose of hastening the coming of universal peace should be embodied in the creed was rejected by Doctor Zamenhof, upon the ground that progress would be retarded by permitting seeming dictation of motives to supersede mere suggestion of means, but the earnest words spoken at Geneva clearly show how close to his heart is the idea. Why for even an instant he should have hesitated to make the appeal we cannot surmise. It is an indubitable fact that, from the earliest times, among primitive beings and savage tribes, to the present days of comparative enlightenment, practically all strife has arisen from a determination of one part of the race to force the acceptance by another of an unfamiliar language, a strange religion or both. Wars without number have resulted from the mere difficulty of reaching an understanding through a mutually intelligible means of communication. Even as late as the past century, as frankly conceded at the recent celebration of the American Board of Foreign Missions, ignorance in men of different races of one another's true beliefs and inability to make comprehensible exposition have constituted the chief stumbling-blocks in the path of religious progression.

Two years ago, or more, the far-seeing Pope Pius X testified his appreciation of this vital condition by conferring his benediction upon all Esperantists and their cause and, during the recent Congress, he authorized the celebration of a Mass in Esperanto in a church of Geneva. On the same Sunday services

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Esperanto were conducted in a Protestant church, affording, wrote the Frenchman René de Saussure, "a very uncommon spectacle — the simultaneous Catholic Mass and Protestant services, in the same language, enabling the people to choose between the preaching of an English clergyman and a Spanish priest." And after the services, in the parks and on the quays of Geneva, "all fraternized cordially, forgetting for a little while all of those things which under ordinary circumstances would have set them apart. In more than one spot I saw happy groups made up of priests and free-thinkers, of socialists and military men. All these people chatted gayly together, as though suddenly aware of the fact that, before being priests or socialists or soldiers, they were men. And I said to myself as I looked at them, surely these few days passed together must result in a great lesson in tolerance of all for all." Viewing these impressive indications and having in mind that the thousand enthusiastic members of the conference represented twenty-eight distinct nationalities from Iceland to Peru, M. Boirac, the famous French educator, declared, "The consequences of Esperanto, so far as concerns the future progress of humanity, will be hardly less important than those that followed the invention of printing."

We would not underrate the broader aspects of the invention of a universal language; indeed, as we have briefly hinted and as appears, though gradually, in Doctor Zamenhof's utterances, they well deserve the most serious consideration; but first must be established its practicability for ordinary commercial usage, assured, we believe, by the ease of acquirement, "owing," as the "Spectator" remarks, "to the irreducible minimum of grammar and the simplicity of its vocabulary." The truth of this claim will receive demonstration in an early number of this REVIEW, which will contain a primer in Esperanto for beginners.

MONDAY, *December 3.* Why Girls are Uninteresting.

FROM a mass of denials, more vehement than convincing, of our recent assertion of the superiority of the American boy over the American girl, it is refreshing to turn to the following communication which we have received from an exceptionally intelligent and keenly observant American woman:

"If our American Girl *is* a bore, as you have chronicled, if she is, at times, somewhat self-conscious and lacking in aspiration, the fault

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must surely lie, not with her, but with the controlling generation. Control is very much out of fashion nowadays. We have grown to believe that real virtue depends upon freedom, and that individuality must come by exercising choice. The great point is that the intelligence comes into the world naked and unadorned, and we must offer it ideals to choose among.

"It may be the outgrowth of the very false impression that girls are *born* better than boys, but, for that or some better reason, we are incomparably more lax in our training of girls than in our training of boys. Fortunately the fashion of ill health for girls, which obtained forty or fifty years ago, has entirely passed; doubtless that generation was paying the fine of the two or three generations who had lived in city houses, climbing stairs and sewing on machines as their chief exercise. The main remedy for the delicacy of young girls being discovered to be fresh air and wholesome exercise, the tradition of enfeebled health promptly died out.

"We have now a sturdy and athletic, an independent and courageous, pleasure-seeker upon our hands. Her schooling and her home training are all too often casual and intermittent. If she goes to a fashionable finishing-school, she learns how to enter and leave a room, how to dress her hair and modulate her voice, but these are at best minor accomplishments for an immortal soul. If she goes to college, she too often learns to look upon intellectual attainment as an end in itself and as a solution of the problem of existence. Finally, she submits to the unspeakable degradation of being put upon the marriage market. She comes home from her school or her college and is deliberately decked out in fine clothes and extravagant trappings, and with whatever subtlety the intention be veiled, she is offered for marriage.

"Perhaps, when one looks at the superficiality of the method of education, it is not altogether a surprise that the young girl is not profoundly attractive. The boy is educated and trained for life; to earn his own living, to be a force amongst men, to use his life. The young girl is offered accomplishments and clothes, in order that she may capture a husband and live, in idleness, upon his work. When we train our girls to noble occupations, when we teach them that they must be a controlling force in life, when we shame them out of superficialities and idleness, and laugh them out of the college-bred absurdity that intellect is the controlling force of life, we shall have an American girl who is just as interesting and just as attractive as the American boy. Girls are as eager as boys for ideals; so eager, in fact, that we have grown somewhat slothful in supplying them."

With this diagnosis of causes, in the main, we agree. That an increase of responsibilities, demanding both absorption and application of ideals, would be beneficial not only to young women themselves but to all humankind there can be no question. Therefore, endow them in common with their brothers with the right

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of direct influence in the conduct of the affairs of their country, and rear them in such a way as to inculcate in their minds a realizing sense of the obligations they are about to assume.

TUESDAY, *December 4.* **The Old-time Home.**

IT was a beautiful thing,—a home in the olden days we can just remember. A place where order and peace reigned; a little space shut off from shadows and illusions; a place where all the bed-linen was scented with dried lavender sewed up in tiny silk bags, and where the cooking was impeccable. It was not a bad profession either, that of being housewife and house-mother; arduous and full of minute cares and day-long claims it was, and yet there are few joys greater than that of building a peaceful refuge for one man and growing-ground for his children. Nor was it necessarily so narrowing a vocation as the present generation is apt to think. It takes wide reading, much thinking, definitely impelled activities to make ideal the surroundings of a child. We were recently approached on the subject of a new Socialistic colony, where all the families are to eat together, where all the children are to be handed over to trained caretakers, to be fed, taught, disciplined and watched over, day and night. "And what is the mother to do?" we asked. "She will be free for her chosen duties, public or private, whatever they be." But we had chanced to overhear a boy say that day to his mother, "There is one thing we oughtn't to miss ever, and that's an hour or two alone together every day!" And we wondered what self-chosen duties that mother would prefer to that daily hour or two alone, bespoken by a twelve-year-old son.

WEDNESDAY, *December 5.* **Day Dreams are the Better.**

OF the two we prefer dreams by day; they are under surer control than those by night, are almost invariably more agreeable, yield finally to an awakening far less rude, and are, in consequence, infinitely more restful and beneficial. Not that even in the profoundest sleep, when, according to the scientists, there is total lapse of mentation, guidance is wholly unattainable; both theory and practice testify to the contrary, although no way has yet been found of tracing the cause from the effect. Why, for example, does speaking in a low, monotonous tone close to the ear of a sleeper induce him to dream of shipwrecks, drowning

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the like? Is there a tone in the voice analogous to and sympathetic with the unceasing moaning of the waves of the sea? or, is the mere general relationship existing between various phases of melancholy responsible? Science as yet offers no solution beyond the curious suggestion that practically all dreams are attributable to the effect of external sounds upon the brain. Pierre Eyquem attached so much importance to this theory that he made a practical application of it in the development of his dull-witted son's genius. For an hour each morning before the boy's awakening, he played soft music in the adjoining room. What part this performed in the making of that marvellous mind cannot, of course, be determined, but there seems to be substantial reason for the belief that some effects resulted, even though, assuredly, the tranquillity one would naturally anticipate was not one of them.

The creator of Peter Ibbetson tacitly admitted the predominant effect of sound, but was so thoroughly convinced of the efficacy of combined mental and physical condition that he set down with audacious precision a primary rule to this effect: "You must always sleep on your back, with your arms above your head, your hands clasped under it, and your feet crossed, the right one over the left, unless you are left-handed; and you must never for a moment cease thinking of where you want to be in your dream till you are asleep and get there, and you must never forget in your dream where and what you are when awake. You must join the dream on to reality." This method is easy, and may have served well the Duchess in her vividly imaginative flights through prison walls and miles of space, but alas! there is a nervous defect in the modern temperament which renders the process worse than unavailing.

We return, then, to the initial assertion of the superior advantages of dreams by day arising chiefly from the greater ease with which they may be regulated. And surely no greater boon has been conferred upon humankind. Take out of life those blissful drowsing moments when the youthful orator has foreseen himself holding a multitude in the hollow of his hand, moving them to laughter or tears at will, or even by the sheer power of his eloquence compelling a jury to free the confessed murderer; deprive the country girl, trudging her way to school, of the vision of an entire court, including both of their gracious Majesties,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bowing before her loveliness; bar even the wretched player of golf from conjuring before the eye of his mind a perfect game, stroke by stroke, made with such grace, power and precision as to be regarded by a thousand onlookers as truly marvellous; rob a statesman of his mental picture of countless generations reverently holding his memory as that of the greatest of the great; steal from the composer the anticipation of slipping shyly from his high chair while the great house resounds with fitting applause of the most impelling opera ever written; take from the girl in the choir the weekly vision between hymns of the ultimate triumph of voice and beauty; and what is left but husks of life? To actual achievement, and to even dreary realism their due; but not less appropriate to the reverie of life than to the sleep of death is the exclamation of the poet,

"What dreams may come!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER.

MARK TWAIN.

For information concerning this distinguished contributor, the reader is referred to the body of the REVIEW, which, during the coming year, will contain chapters selected from his Autobiography.

SENATOR C. W. FULTON,

of Oregon, was born in Ohio. He was educated in Magnolia, Iowa, and Pawnee City, Nebraska. He read law in the office of A. H. Babcock, Pawnee City, Nebraska, from 1870 to 1873. He was admitted to the bar in 1875, and began the practice of law at Astoria in that year. He served as State Senator in 1878, 1890, 1898, 1902. He was elected United States Senator in 1903.

DEMETRIUS C. BOULGER

has paid much attention to the foreign interests of Great Britain as these come into rivalry with the political or commercial plans of other peoples. He has contributed to all the leading journals on questions connected with the British Indian Empire, China, Egypt and Turkey since 1876. He has also closely studied military questions, particularly those bearing upon the French frontiers and the position of Belgium. Among the works he has published may be mentioned "The Life of Yakoob Bey of Kashgar," "England and Russia in Central Asia," "Central Asian Portraits," "The History of China," "Armies of the Native States of India," and "Central Asian Questions."

"ANTI-FEDERALIST"

is a political writer and thinker of national importance who has long studied our national development.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DR. THOMAS DARLINGTON,

Commissioner and President of the New York Board of Health, was educated in the New York University and graduated from the College of Physicians and Surgeons (Columbia University) in 1880. He is visiting physician in the New York Foundling Hospital; consulting physician in the French Hospital; attending physician in St. John's, Riverside and Fordham Hospitals. He has written much on medical and climatological subjects.

ALICE HENRY,

writer and speaker, is a native of Melbourne, is of Scotch descent and the daughter of the late Charles Ferguson and Margaret Walker Henry, colonists of 1852. She was thirteen years on the staff of the "Melbourne Australasian." Besides contributing widely to the Australian press, she has contributed articles to the "Westminster Review," the "Manchester Guardian," the "International Journal of the Ethics," the "Outlook" and other journals. Her public work has been mainly in connection with efforts to assist crippled and neglected children. During the last year she has made a careful investigation of the work carried on in that direction both in England and the United States.

MAYO W. HAZELTINE

is no stranger to the readers of the REVIEW, to which he has been a contributor, on questions of international import, for many years. Mr. Hazeltine studied at Harvard and at Oxford, and he is recognized as the scholar among American journalists.

CAPTAIN M. F. STEELE, U.S.A.,

was born in Huntsville, Alabama, in 1861. His people were all Southerners and his parents and grandparents were all slave-holders. He was graduated from the Military Academy at West Point in 1883, and assigned to the 8th Cavalry. After his promotion to Captain and assignment to the 6th Cavalry he was appointed adjutant of that regiment. He was *aide* on General Wheeler's staff in the Santiago campaign in Cuba. He served in the Philippines, first as major in the 30th United States Volunteer Regiment during active

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hostilities against insurgents, and later in command of his troop of the 6th Cavalry. He has been on duty at the United States Staff College and Infantry and Cavalry School at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, for the last three years, as an instructor in the Department of Military Art. He has special charge of the course in strategy and is lecturer on military history.

H. C. Lodge,

one of the most cultured and scholarly of American statesmen, has long held a large place in the esteem of his countrymen. He was editor of The North American Review from 1873 to 1876, and in the latter year he was appointed University Lecturer on American History at Harvard, a position which he held for three years. In 1886 he was elected a member of the House of Representatives, and during the years in which he served his constituency in that capacity he exhibited such marked ability in representing their interests, and in dealing with the greater questions of national concern which came up for consideration in the lower house of Congress, that in 1893 he was transferred to the United States Senate, in whose deliberations he has ever since taken a commanding part. Senator Lodge has been a life-long student of American history. Among the works which have resulted from his investigations in this field may be mentioned "A Short History of the English Colonies in America," "The Story of the American Revolution," "Hero Tales from American History," and, in the "American Statesmen Series," the lives of Daniel Webster, Alexander Hamilton and George Washington.

General O. O. Howard

retired from the American army in 1894 after a long and active career. He rendered distinguished service in campaigns against the Indians and in the Civil War. When the Rebellion broke out, he was a lieutenant in the regular army, and he was appointed Colonel of the 3rd Maine Regiment of Volunteers. After passing through various grades, he was made Commander of the Department of the Tennessee in July, 1864. Since the close of the Civil War, he has com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manded the Departments, successively, of the Columbia, the Platte, the Pacific and the Atlantic.

CHRISTIAN BRINTON

was born at Thornbury, Pennsylvania, and graduated from Haverford College in 1892; he studied later at the University of Paris. He was associate editor of "The Critic" from 1900 to 1903; art director of "Everybody's Magazine" in 1903-1904. He has contributed to "The Century," "Harper's," "The Bookman," "The Critic" and other magazines.

M. A. DE WOLFE HOWE

is associate editor of "The Youth's Companion." He graduated from Lehigh University in 1886 and from Harvard in 1887. He is the author of "Shadows," "American Bookmen," "Philips Brooks" (in Beacon Biographies series), "Boston, the Place and the People," and he edited "The Memory of Lincoln" and "The Beacon Biographies."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED